

Studies in Chuvash Etymology I.

Edited by

A. Róna-Tas

studia uralo-altaica

17

Redigunt

P. HAJDÚ.

T. MIKOLA

A. RÓNA-TAS

All orders, with the exception of the socialist countries, should be addressed to John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Holland. Orders from the socialist countries should be sent to Kultura, Hungarian Trading Company for Books and Newspapers (H-1389 BUDAPEST 62 P. O. B. 149.)

UNIVERSITAS SZEGEDIENSIS DE ATTILA JÓZSEF NOMINATA

B 97721

**STUDIES
IN
CHUVASH ETYMOLOGY
I**

Edited by
A. RÓNA—TAS

**SZEGED
1982**

Editionis curam agit

ZSUZSA BODÓ



B 97721

SZTE Egyetemi Könyvtár



J000297386

CONTENTS

András Róna-Tas

Preface 6

Julius Németh

The Meaning of the Etnonym Bulgar 7

Arpád Berta

*Zwei Wolgabulgarische Lehnwörter in der
Mundart der getauften Tataren* 14

Hasan Eren

*Remarks on V.G. Egorov's Etymological
Dictionary of the Chuvash Language* 20

András Róna-Tas

*Loan-Words of Ultimate Middle Mongolian
Origin in Chuvash* 66

András Róna-Tas

*Some Volga Bulgarian Words in the Volga
Kipchak Languages* 135

András Róna-Tas

Three Volga Kipchak Etymologies 152

András Róna-Tas - Károly Rédei

*Proto-Permian and Votyak Loan-Words in
Chuvash* 158

Adám Molnár

*A Select Bibliography Towards a Future
Etymological Dictionary of Chuvash* 180

Abbreviations 239

P R E F A C E

For quite some time now, Chuvash scholars and scholars from the Department of Altaistics, József Attila University, Szeged have been working in close collaboration. One of the aims of our common effort has been to lay down the foundations of a new Etymological Dictionary of the Chuvash Language. To this end, considerable amount of preparatory work - collecting historical and dialectal data - has already been done in Cheboksary.

This volume presents a few papers on the very complicated subject of Chuvash etymology. With the exception of Árpád Berta's paper, all the articles have already appeared in languages and journals not easily accessible to most of the scholarly world. The late Prof. Julius Németh's paper was published in German in *Studia in Honorem Veselini Besevliev*; the English translation is of a slightly revised version. Hasan Eren's paper has been published in Turkish, my papers in Hungarian. Ádám Molnár has compiled a useful bibliography which, though far from being complete, will hopefully help readers find their bearings in the vast amount literature connected with the history of the Chuvash people and language. We offer this volume as the first contribution to our common project.

My sincere thanks go to Ádám Molnár for his help in editing this volume.

Szeged, January 1982.

András Róna-Tas

THE MEANING OF THE ETNONYM BULYAR⁺

by

JULIUS NÉMETH

The literature on the etymology of the etnonym Bulyar is to be found in Moravcsik (1958, p. 104). Since 1958, some publications have dwelt on the topic; I shall deal with them, so far as they are known to me, without observing a chronological order.

Tomaschek (1872, p. 156, 1877, p. 683), more than a hundred years ago, explained the etnonym Bulyar as "Mischling" from the Turkic verb bulγa- "to mix"¹. The earlier data, as far as I can see, do not offer any substantial help concerning the explanation of the name. A new and exhaustive critical review of the material, which in some respect not always clear, can be found in Doerfer 1963-75 II, pp. 315-320, 353-354². Most recently, we read in Räsänen 1969: bulyar "Volksname, Bulgarei < bulγa-r "mischend".

In the year 1927, when I had the good fortune to become acquainted with my highly esteemed colleague, V. Beševliev, I tried to give a thorough phonetical and semantical explanation of this name (Németh 1927). I found

+ First published in German: Die Bedeutung des bulgarischen Volksnamen: Studia in Honorem Veselini Beševliev, Sofia 1978, 68-71.

that phonetically the explanation is acceptable, and I agreed with it, but I translated the name as "gemischtes (Volk)", assuming, in accordance with my opinion of that time, that it was connected with the mixing of the Huns and Bulgars in the Caucasus region. At that time, however, I had also an other semantical explanation in mind, which I pointed out at the end of my paper: "Je veux observer enfin que dans l'inscription de Tonyuquq (l.22. respectivement 23 dans Radloff) on trouve également un mot dérivé du verb bulğa- pour caractériser l'état de la nation: (türk bodun' i yime) bulğanc (ol timiş), mots que Thomsen traduit³: 'Das Türkenvolk ist in Unruhe, (sagte er)...' tandis que dans Radloff, Alttürk. Inschr. Zw. F. S. 11, nous lisons: '(Das Türk-Volk ist) in Verwirrung... sagten sie' -- La ville hindoue de Lakhnauti porte également le nom turc de Bulğak-pur 'ville du désordre, de l'émeute' (von Le Coq, Türkische Namen und Titel in Indien, Mélanges Garbe 1927, p.2)".

I repeated in 1930 this possible explanation in more details in my book on the land conquering of the Hungarians (Németh 1930 pp. 95-97). There I also cited the OT expression il bulğayınğa (Müller 1910, p.78, line 35), "in die Staatsverwirrung" and added: "It is clear that an attribute which - as we see - often denotes the (political) situation of a state or a people, becomes easily an

etnonym."

In the last years, on strength of the data on the verb bulʹa- and its derivatives provided by the new OT dictionary of the Soviet Academy (DTS) and based on the knowledge gathered over more than fifty years on the OT etnonyms, I abandoned the former semantic explanation and prefer my second one, because it is not connected with a historical hypothesis but only with linguistic facts.

The DTS, this highly important epoch making work of the respective Russian and Soviet Turkology, gives the following meanings of bulʹa- "1. peremešivat', smešivat'; to mix (e.g. drugs), 2. mutit'; to stir (water), the same in figurative sense; 3. dosaždat', obizhat', pečalit', omračat', vredit'; to vex, to offend, to 'sadden, to overshadow, to hurt; 4. возбуždat' nedovol'stvo, sejat' smutu; to instigate, incite disaffection, revolt".

I would like now to stress, that the meaning under No. 4 often occurs in connection with the political situation of a people and that the OT etnonyms are predominantly connected with political circumstances.

In the DTS we find in addition to the already cited data: bulʹaq "zamešatel'stvo, возбуždenie, bezpokojsstvo, smjatenie, panika" with many citations (in Gabain 1950, p.305 "Verwirrung, Aufruhr", Doerfer 1962, p.261 "Rebellion"). Dr. Zieme called my attention to the quotation



örlet- bulya- "mučit' i privodit' v zamešatel'stvo" (DTS, p.389). I would add from the DTS phrases as el bulandī "v narode načinalis' smuty" (Kašg.), ötrü gama éliniz bulanyay "togda vse vaše gosudarstvo pridet v smjatenie" (TT II), bodun bulyanuqin siyasāt sūzār "volnenie naroda uspokaivaet diplomatija" (QB) etc.

Likely suggestive are the data from the newest and best dictionary of the only surviving Bulgar-Turkic language, the Chuvash (Sirotkin 1961): pālxav (< bulyaq) "bunt, mjatež; volnenie, tregova", pālxavār "perepoloh, sumatoha, tregova; (archaic) vosstanie", pālxavlā "mjatežnyj, smutnyj", pālxavšā "buntar', mjatežnik", pālxan- "stanovit'sja mutnym, mutit'sja; buntovat'; volnovat'sja, bezpokoit'sja" (fact. pālxantar-), pālxanu "smuta, bunt; volnenie, tregova, sumatoha", pālxanullā "smutnyj, mjatežnyj, mjatežno; trevožnyj, trevožno", pālxar "bolgarin, bolgarskij", pālxarla "po bolgarskij; bolgarskij"; pālxat- "mutit' (židkost'); voroščit' (napr. vešči)", in figurative sense: "sejat' smutu, podstrekat', priživat' k buntu".

These are surprising and archaic data on the explanation of an archaic ethnonym and likely peculiar are the occurrences in the OT inscriptions already cited further in Ibn Muhanna bulyaq, Kumyk bulgavur (!)" smuta, smjatenie, neurjadica", Alt, Verbickij (1884) pīlgaq, Khakass pīlgax, pulgax "sumahota smjatenie, vozmuščenie,

trevoga" etc. (see Egorov 1964, p.147, Joki 1952).

The ethonym Bulgar pertains here too. We do not know what the meaning of bulgar was as an appellative; it does not occur as such. The verb bulga- has the following meaning in a political context: "to cause a state of disorder" (and not "to resist") and the nomen verbale with -r: bulgar "Aufwühler, Aufwiegler, Revolutionär", Bulgar is thus: "das Volk der Revolutionäre, das Volk von Leuten, die gegen die Herrschaft zum Aufruhr reizen".

The name is a symbol of the love of freedom of the Bulgarian people. This is not an empty phraseology. The word race has been often discredited, but the people have their character.

I have dealt with the double category "loyal-rebel" in the Turkic etnonyms in 1930 (pp. 38-39). To this pertains Bulgar on the one hand, and, on the other, the etnonyms Avšar "der sich ergibt", Šah-seven "der den Shach lieb hat" and most likely Uygur "folgend, sich anpassend".

x

The new literature on the name offers nothing of essential importance. Pelliot's opinion can be found in Pelliot 1949, p.228, with a meticulous analysis of the carefully collected data. He writes: "...Ne serait-il pas possible, que Bulgar fut en réalité une forme à

suffixe -gar du verbe bul- qui signifie "trouver", et par suite, au point de vue sémantique, un synonyme de Tapar ~ Tabar dont il a été question plus haut (p. 183)? Sans pouvoir en administrer la preuve formelle, c'est à cette solution que j'incline actuellement".

The Pelliot's hypothesis is subtly conceived, but semantically very weak (and morphologically not very successful).

A very good short summary of the earlier investigations can be found in Vasmer's Russian etymological dictionary (Vasmer I, p. 102).

For various reasons it is to be very important to me what J. B. Rudnickij writes (1962)⁴: (bolhárin) "The name is generally considered as a Tk. borrowing in Sl., the ultimate source being OTk. bulgar half-breed, one of mixed race", cf. bulgamak "to mix"; according to Pelliot, Oeuvres posthumes 2 (Paris 1950), 228-229, the name orig. meant "rebell, troubler" [on loc. cit. Pelliot says nothing similar, this is my hypothesis layed in 1927.]; in his Origins of Russia (87) G. Vernadsky derives the name from the Alanic: "in Ossetic bylgaeron "means shore, bank (of a river)"; also "edge (of a bluff, or a hill)". On this basis the name "Bulgar" might be interpreted as "Shore people". The name seems to be of the same type as that of the Slavic tribe Pomonare ("Sea

Shore" tribe). It should be noted that in Byzantine sources the area of the Origin of Great Bulgaria is defined as stretching from Maeotis (i.e. Sea of Azov) to the "Kouphis (i.e. Kuban) River" [a not very convincing hypothesis]; inconceivable are attempts to derive the name from G. Balger "fighter", Dečev ZONF 2, 198-199, or from the name of the Volga River respectively".

See also the new etymological dictionary of the Bulgarian language: Bălgarski étimologičen rečnik, p. 99.

Notes

- ¹ On a collation of data, connections and etymology of this verb see in Joki 1952, pp. 88, 109. I would add the data of Abušqa (Ed. by Á. Vámbéry, p. 37), Tarama Sözlüğü: bulgalak, Derleme Sözlüğü: bul- etc.
- ² I do not see Boodberg, HJAS I, p. 291 cited.
- ³ ZDMG NF. III, p. 165, Samlede Afhandlinger III, p. 507; see most recently Beševliev 1970.
- ⁴ L. Kiss was kind to call my attention to this work. I have to offer my thanks to him also for some other data.

ZWEI WOLGABOLGARISCHE LEHNWÖRTER IN DER
MUNDART DER GETAUFTEN TATAREN

von
ÁRPÁD BERTA

In seinem Aufsatz "Some Volga Bulgarian Words in the Volga Kipchak Languages" hat Professor Róna-Tas darauf hingewiesen, dass es neben der gut bekannten Richtung der Entlehnungen (Tatarische → Tschuwassische) auch zahlreiche Fälle gibt, wo die Richtung der Entlehnungen umgekehrt ist.¹

Während der Beschäftigung mit den tatarischen Aufzeichnungen von Gábor Bálint² fielen mir einige mundartliche Wörter auf, die in das Tatarische aus dem Wolgabulgarischen eingedrungen sind. Ich möchte hier zwei Wörter von ihnen behandeln.

1. tatBOstr šöklan- 'elidegenit, ellop; entwenden'
< ^xšuklan- ← WB ^xšuxlan- < ^xšoqlan- vgl.
PT ^xyöq 'es gibt nichts'

Türkische Angaben:³

Kiptschakische: yugal- 'terjat' sja, propadat',
isčezat', skryt' sja' (tat), yugalt- 'terjat', utračivat'
(ebd), yöřal-, yural- 'elveszik, verlorengelien, umkommen' (tatB), yuralt- 'elveszt, verlieren, unkommen lassen' (ebd), yugal'-, řuray- 'propadat', terjat' sja'
(TTDS), yugat'-, yurat'-, řuraltın- 'terjat', poterjat''

(ebd), yufal- 'poterjat'sja' (baschk), yufalt- 'poterjat'' (ebd), jogol- 'poterjat'sja, isčeznut', sginut', propast'' (kirg), jogot- 'poterjat', utratit', rastratit'' (ebd);

Ogusische: yokol- 'uničtožat'sja, byt' uničtožennym, pogibat', isčezat'' (osm), yokla- 'vspominat', tratit', rashodovat', terjat', uničtožat', ubivat'' (tkm), yoklan- 'vspominat'sja, byt' potračennym, izrashodovannym, tratit'sja, rashodovat'sja, byt' uterjannym, terjat'sja, byt' uničtožennym, uničtožat'sja, byt' ubitym' (ebd), yogal- 'propadat', isčezat' (postepenno), terjat'sja, umirat', pogibat' (ebd);

Tschuwassische: šuxal- 'propadat', isčezat'' (Ašmarin XII, 289), šuxat- 'terjat'' (ebd).

Die türkischen Angaben aus den anderen Sprachgruppen s. Clauson 900a, 902ab; Räsänen 1969, 205b; Egorov 1964, 222.

Die angeführten türkischen Wortformen gehen auf die urtürkischen Verbalstämme ^xyōqād- 'umkommen', ^xyoqal- 'umkommen, verlorengelassen', ^xyoqalt- 'verlieren, umkommen lassen' zurück.⁴

Die für das tatarische mundartliche Zeitwort šöklan- 'entwenden' als Quelle vermutete wolgabolgarische Wortform ^xšuxlan- < ^xjoqlan- ~ PT ^xyoqlan- geht unmittelbar auf ^xyōq 'es gibt nichts' zurück: ^xyōq + -la- 'Verbal-suffix' + -n 'Suffix des Passivums'. Zur Bildung vgl. die angeführten türkmeneischen Zeitwörter (yokla- und

yoklan-).⁵

Die Bedeutung des tatarischen Zeitwortes šöklan- 'entwenden' lässt sich durch folgende Kette der Bedeutungs-entwicklung erklären: 'verloren, vernichtet werden' > 'jmdm. Verlust verursachen' > 'entwenden'. Die passivische Bedeutung dürfte sich vielleicht auf dem tatarischen Sprachgebiet verdunkelt haben.⁶

Die Konsonanten des wolgabolgarischen Zeitwortes x₁auxlan- ä- und -x- wurden im Tatarischen durch š- und -k- substituiert.⁷ Das Wort ist vor der tatarischen Lautentwicklung x₁u > ö entlehnt worden.

2. tatB širt 'csoroszlya, hosszú vas (ekén); Pflugmesser' < x₁širt ← WB x₁širt < x₁sirt ~ PT sirt 'Rücken'

Türkische Angaben:

Kiptschakische: sirt 'hřebet, spina, gornyj hřebet, krjaž, greben' gory' (tat), sirt 'hát, hátgerinc, hegygerinc, Rücken, Rückgrat, Bergrücken' (tatB), pčak sirtī 'kэшát, (kэшfoka), Messerrücken' (ebd), sirt 'zadnjaja storona čego-l.' (TTDS), širt 'konskij volos' (ebd), hirt 'spina, hřebet, greben'' (baschk), sirt 'vnešnaja storona, vnešnost'; to, čto nahoditsja ne vnutri, a za predelami čego-l.; periferija; mestnost' otstojaščaja daleko ot stolicy, ot goroda; tyl'naja storona, spinka, obuh (noža, meča); syrty (vysokogornoe plato, vysokogornaja dolina)' (kirg);

Ogusische: sirt 'spina, greben' (gory, holma), spinka, tupaja storona (noža i t.p.)' (osm), sirt 'zadnjaja čast', vozvyšennost'' (tkm);

Tschuwassische: särt 'holm, vozvyšennost'' (Ašmarin XI, 278-9), šärt 'čast' pluga, sabana; verhnie plavniki u ryby na spine' (Ašmarin XVII, 340).

Die weiteren türkischen Angaben s. Clauson 846ab; Räsänen 1969, 419b; Egorov 1964, 184.

Die hierher gehörenden türkischen Wortformen weisen eine breite Bedeutungsentwicklung auf. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des PT ^xsirt konnte nach Clauson 'Rücken' sein.⁸ Die anderen Bedeutungen, wie 'Rückgrat', 'Bergrücken', 'Messerrücken', 'Pflugmesser',⁹ 'Rückenflosse', 'Mähne' (d.h. das was auf dem Genick des Pferdes ist) u. s. w. lassen sich aus der ursprünglichen Bedeutung 'Rücken' gut erklären.

Die angeführten kiptschakischen und ogusischen Wortformen mit anlautendem s- (baschk h-) sind die "erwarteten" Entsprechungen des PT ^xsirt. Das tschuwassische šärt

'Pflugmesser, Rückenflosse' ist ebenso eine regelmässig entwickelte Form (WB ^xs- vor -i- > š- und WB ^x-i- > -š-). Das Wort särt 'Hügel, Höhe' kann dagegen eine Entlehnung aus dem Tatarischen sein.¹⁰

Die tatarischen mundartlichen Wortformen širt 'Pflugmesser' und širt 'Mähne' sind wolgabolgarischen Entlehnungen.¹¹

Anmerkungen

- 1 Róna-Tas 1976, 169-75.
- 2 Bálint 1875-77. Der Verfasser dieses Artikels hat die textkritische Neuausgabe der Aufzeichnungen von Bálint im Druck.
- 3 Die der Etymologie angehörigen Wörter sind -ausser dem Tschuwassischen- nur aus dem Tatarischen, Baschkirischen, Kirgisischen, Osmanischen und Türkmenischen zitiert. Die türkischen Angaben aus den anderen Türksprachen siehe in den Wörterbüchern von Clauson, Räsänen und Egorov.
- 4 s. Clauson a.a.O. Clauson führt diese Verbalformen auf das Wort ^xyōq < ^xyō- + -q 'dev. Nomensuffix' zurück. Auf das ehemalige Vorhandensein des Stammes ^xyō- weisen auch die folgenden Verba hin: yuy- 'terjat', poterjat' (TTDS), yuyal- 'propadat', terjat'sja' (ebd), yuyal- 'elveszik, verloren gehen, umkommen' (tatB), yuyalt-, yuyilt- 'elveszít; verlieren, umkommen lassen' (ebd), yoy- 'uničtožat', likvidirovat', utračivat', terjat' (kirg), yoyul- 'uničtožat'sja, utračivat'sja', terjat'sja' (ebd). Diese Verbalformen deuten den Verbalstamm ^xyōd- 'liquidieren' < ^xyō- + -d an.
- 5 Vgl. auch Levitskaja 1976, 165-7.
- 6 s. Bálint 1877, 85, wo Bálint darauf hinweist, dass die mit -n suffigierten Verba in der Mundart der getauften Tataren auch ohne passivische Bedeutung gebraucht werden können.
- 7 Zu der Substitution des anlautenden WB ^xǵ- durch ^ǵ- im Tatarischen s. Róna-Tas 1976, 173. In der Mundart der getauften Tataren steht immer k statt q.

- 8 s. Clauson a.a.O.
- 9 Nach ihrer Form hatte die Pflugschar wichtige Ähnlichkeiten mit dem Messer(rücken), s. darüber Muhametšin 1977, 39.
- 10 Es kann aber nicht völlig ausgeschlossen werden, dass das WB ^xsirt - um Homonymformen zu vermeiden - unregelmässig zu särt wurde. In diesem Falle könnte auch das ung. szirt 'Felsen' - trotz des anlautenden s- (orth. sz-) - zu den bolgartürkischen Lehnwörtern der ungarischen Sprache gerechnet werden.
- 11 Die Lautgestalt des wolgabolgarischen Wortes konnte zur Zeit der Entlehnung ^xsirt oder šärt sein. Die Entlehnung des WB ^xsirt 'Pflugmesser' weist auf die Rolle der Wolgabolgaren in der Pflugbauwirtschaft im Wolga-Gebiet hin. Die Bedeutung 'Pflugmesser, Pflugschar' darf aber nicht als eine spezielle wolgabolgarische Bedeutungsentwicklung betrachtet werden. Vgl. dazu AAH: sirt 'yūksek arazi, Kıpçakçada - sapan demiri', s. auch Clauson a.a.O.

REMARKS ON V.G. EGOROV'S ETYMOLOGICAL
DICTIONARY OF THE CHUVASH LANGUAGE⁺

by

HASAN EREN

In point of vocalism and grammatical structure, the Chuvash language has a special place among Turkic languages. For that reason, it seemed essential that Turcologists study the Chuvash language and determine its place among the Turkic languages by taking into consideration questions of phonetics and grammar. Several European scholars have joined in this activity. As it became clear that, in addition to Hungarian and Cheremis (Mari), a good many languages had been affected by Chuvash, Hungarian and Finnish scholars in particular have made special efforts in that field. Of the Hungarian scholars, J. Budenz, Z. Gombocz, J. Németh and L. Ligeti may be mentioned as examples. Of Finnish scholars, Y. Wichmann, H. Paasonen, G. J. Ramstedt and M. Räsänen deserve notice. N. Poppe has also discussed the subject.

During World War II, J. Benzing was studying the Chuvash language in Germany, while in Denmark, K. Grønbech kept going the Chuvash dialect studies, a tradition since V. Grønbech began work in this field. O. Pritsak, as well, wrote some valuable papers on like subjects.

⁺ First published in Turkish: Çuvag Dilinin Etymologique Sözlüğü: Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten 1972, pp. 241-265.

In Russia, N.I. Aŝmarin was the most prominent specialist in Chuvash language. It was particularly through his Thesaurus linguae Tschuvaschorum that Aŝmarin became well-known. In recent years, V.G. Egorov has published some papers of value on the subject. Egorov's first major work was published in 1930. As a continuation of that work he recently published a Chuvash etymological dictionary (1964).

Egorov's above-mentioned work has aroused wide scientific interest since its publication. Of its review and critical notices in learned journals, K.H. Menges's (1968a) and J. Németh's works (1970) deserve mention. Following in their footsteps, I wish to make my comments on Egorov's dictionary.

On page 30, Egorov compares the Chuvash form of the word arāk, arkă 'skirt' to the Turkish etek, which in my view is incorrect. The Turkic sound -t- (< OT ^x-t-) has been retained by the Chuvash language. It is well-known, however, that the OT ^x-d- has become -r- in Chuvash, as e.g., in OT ^xadaq > Chuv. ura 'foot'. OT ^xqadin > Chuv. xurăn 'beech tree'. The Turkic word etek takes the form etek or itek in every dialect. The form edek to be found in Altai (Oirat), Teleut and Shor is secondary. Thus we cannot assume the existence of the form edek in

Old Turkic. Consequently, it would be erroneous to relate the Chuvash word arāk to the Turkic etek.

On pages 31-32, Egorov states that the Chuvash word arāslan 'lion' is a borrowing from Tatar. Nevertheless, an archaic form of this word: uslan kayāk (kayāk) is still used by the Chuvash people.

It is quite clear from the entry that Egorov was unaware of the existence of a number of papers about the word arslan. We may pass over the fact that he does not seem to have read L. Patrubányi's article (1881), but he should have made use of the conclusions drawn in the seminal essay of W. Bang (1916-17). A. Ščerbak in his work (1961) turned to account both Patrubányi's and Bang's conclusions (pp. 137-138). But it seems like Egorov had not read those works, and his sources did not range beyond the writings of Ramstedt and Ščerbak.

J. Németh (1942) made comments upon the etymology of the Turkish word arslan. Ščerbak, who also discussed the etymology of the word, had no knowledge of Németh's paper. This fact makes us understand why Egorov, like Ščerbak, has not come to hear about the paper.

On page 32, under the heading arman 'mill', Egorov gives the cognates of the Turkish word değirmen in other Turkic languages: Kirgiz tegirmen, Uzbek tegirmon, Turkmen degirmen, Kara-Kalpak digirman. It is quite

clear that the Chuv. arman (< avärman) can be traced back to the stem avär- (~ evir-) 'to turn'. In fact, there is no difference between the structure of this word and değirmen. However, the cognates of değirmen in the other Turkic languages should not have been entered.

The Chuvash word aşak 'ass' on p. 38 is a loan-word from Tatar.

On p. 46, when enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word valak (or vulak) 'groove', Egorov mixed up the Turkic forms oluk and yalak. It goes without saying that the Chuv. valak has been traced back to oluq. Thus the inclusion of yalak in addition to olaq is wrong. Recently, also, the Hungarian word vályú has been traced back to Chuvash (Palló 1971a, p. 85).

On p. 48, after the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word vākār (or mākār) 'ox', the Hungarian word ökör should have been mentioned, as well. Moreover, the author should have taken into consideration the publications about the origin of this word by J. Németh and G. J. Ramstedt.

On p. 60, having enumerated the cognates of the Chuvash word yevčĕ 'matchmaker', the Turkish elçi, Bashk. yausi, Tat. yauči, Kara-Kalpak ĵauşı, Turkmen savči, the author adds the comment that the word elçi

derives from the Turkic stem el, il.

This entry needs elaboration on more than one account:

/1/ the Chuvash word yevčĕ cannot be related to the

Turkish elçi,

/2/ the Turkish word elçi cannot be traced back to the stem el (or il),

/3/ the Chuvash word cannot be compared to the Tatar form yauči (~ Bashk. yauči),

/4/ no connection whatever is to be supposed between the Tatar word yauči and the Turkmen savči.

I would argue that of the forms given by Egorov, the Tatar word yauči alone can be taken into consideration.

On p. 73 Egorov, besides enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word yăva 'nest, home', touches upon the question of tracing back the Turkish word yuva (~ uya) to the word (stem) öy-, üy- 'to prevent, to stop'. To the best of my knowledge, the origin of the Turkish word yuva has been unidentified to this day. But, at any rate, it cannot be connected with the stem öy-, üy-. And in this ten-try the author should have disclosed that the word yăva was borrowed into Chuvash from the neighbouring languages.

Similarly, it is quite clear that the Chuv. yăvaš 'slow' is another borrowing from Tatar.

I could not find the form yïči, suggested by the

author to be the cognate of the Chuvash word yāvă on page 73, when trying to look it up in Mahmud Kāšgarī's Divan (Brockelmann). In addition to this, Egorov includes the following forms: Turkish koyu, Bashk. quyi, Nogay qoyi, Kazakh and Kara-Kalpak qoyu. To the Nogay word qoyi the author has attached the word yiyi 'thick', as well.

In my opinion, the Chuvash word yāvă should not have been compared to any other form but yiyi. It is a known fact that the Turkic sound q- changed to y- in several Chuvash words, e.g. Turkic qal- ~ Chuv. yul-, Turkic qan ~ Chuv. yun, Turkic qar- ~ Chuv. yur. (The Chuvash cognate of the Turkic word qanat is śunat which, doubtlessly, goes back to the form ⁺yunat.) Consequently, it may be supposed that the Chuvash form yāvă is derived from the word qoyu. Nevertheless, it is the Nogay word yiyi, which seems to be the most closely related to the Chuv. yāvă, both in point of phonetics and of semantics.

On p. 74, Egorov states that he could not find the counterparts of the Chuvash word yāmăk 'sister' in the other Turkic languages. As mentioned also by Egorov, G.J. Ramstedt (1922-23, p. 20) traced back this word to the Turkic qurna 'second wife'. Yet, Ramstedt's comparison cannot be easily adopted. It would be difficult to connect the two words even in terms of phonetics. We are aware of the fact that the Turkic sound q- changed to

γ- in many Chuvash words (e.g., Turkic qal-, qan, qîn Chuv. yul, yun, yěñě). But it cannot be supposed that, as a result of the above sound-change, a form like the Chuv. yāmāk developed from the Turkic quma. L. Ligeti argued (1938) that the sound-change q- > γ-, which has taken place in Chuvash, can be observed in words containing a long vowel. With the word quma, this is out of the question. We have no alternative but to adopt the opinion of G. Doerfer, who argues that the Turkic quma is a loan-word in Turkish from Mongolian (I, item 287).

On p. 75, the author has failed to indicate the fact that the Chuvash words yāmran and yāñăŷ were borrowed into Chuvash from Tatar.

Similarly, it is evident that the Chuvash word yăpar has also been borrowed from the neighbouring languages. Moreover, the author has failed to mention that the Turkic yîpar has a counterpart in Hungarian (the Hungarian word gyopár). Recently, in 1969, an excellent paper was written on the Hungarian word gyopár by L. Ligeti.

On page 76, the author states that the derivation of the Chuvash word yărana 'stirrup' is unknown to him. H. Paasonen (1908), connected this word with the Turkic word ûzenj. Following Paasonen, Z. Gombocz also adopted this comparison (1902a).

The question of the Turkic counterparts of the

Chuvash word yěner 'saddle' on page 78 is rather complex. Egorov has listed the various forms of the Turkic word eyer (< eder) (eyer, eger, ezer ...) as cognates. It follows from the above instances that the Turkic word eyer goes back to the form eder. The counterpart of the Turkic sound -d- is supposed to be -r- in Chuvash, as in the Turkic adaq 'foot' ~ Chuv. ura, Turkic adiq 'sober' Chuv. ură, etc. Consequently, in Chuvash, the form ^xerer should be inferred to be the counterpart of the Turkic word eder. Thus, whether the Chuv. yěner could be compared with the Turkic eyer (eger, ezer), ~~is a~~ question to be considered carefully.

On page 84, Egorov has confined himself to comparing the Chuvash form kavăn 'gourd' with the Turkic qavun (Tat. qavın, Turkmen gavın ...). It is evident that this word has been adopted into Chuvash from the neighbouring Turkic languages.

As to the derivation of the Turkic word qavun from Arabian, I am quite certain that this is absolutely improper. This word, which has long been current in the Turkic languages, cannot be of Arabic derivation.

On page 88, the author has added the form kenevir to the Turkish word kendir as a cognate of the Chuv. kantăr 'hemp'. In my view, under the Chuvash word kantăr, it would have been sufficient to list the form

kendir, still current in most Turkic languages, as a cognate. However, the word kenevir, which is not represented in any other Turkish dialect except that of Anatolia, cannot be compared with the Turkic kendir. If at all, only the stems of the two words could be connected.

It is a known fact that several words analogous to kendir may be found in Greek, German, and the Slavic languages. These words were dealt with in a publication by Z. Gombocz (1927).

It is also known that the Hungarian word kender 'hemp' has been taken into Hungarian from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 92-93). This word was classed by Gombocz among Bulgar-Turkic loan-words. Consequently, the Hung. kender may have been grouped under kantăr.

On pages 88-89, Egorov has grouped together into the cognates of the Chuv. kap 'shape, form' the Turkic forms qap and kep. In my view, he should not have confused the qap with kep. It is obvious that it is the Turkic word kep, which the Chuv. kap can be related to. The Hungarian word kép 'picture' has also been adopted from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 93-94).

On page 95, under kačaka 'goat', Egorov has failed to refer to the Hungarian word kecske. Yet, this is the form, which is the most closely related to the Chuvash form kačaka. If Egorov had taken this fact into consid-

eration, he could not have traced back the Chuvash word kačaka to the form kača taka.

Under this heading, the author should also have discussed, besides the Turkic word keči, the form ečki, represented in all the other Turkic dialects. Z. Gombocz, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Hungarian word kecske, first wanted to distinguish the form ečki from the word keči, but in his later works he dealt more and more often with the close connection between the two words. J. Németh (1942, pp. 286-300) though agreeing with Gombocz's view, was not against comparing the Turkic word keči (~ kečki) with the form ečki. Like Németh, T. Halasi-Kun, in his work on the dropping out of the Kipchak sound k-, connected the Turkic forms keči and ečki (1950, pp. 50-51). Finally, A. M. Ščerbak (1961) took the view that the forms keči and ečki can be traced back to a common stem.

In J. Németh's above-mentioned work, the etymology of the word keči can also be found; in my paper (1953, p. 55), I also attempted to support this etymology by supplying a new piece of evidence.

Ščerbak stated in his above-mentioned work that the Chuv. kačaka was a loan-word from Russian. The Bashk. keze and the Tat. kāzā are also supposed to be loan-words but the Chuv. kačaka can have nothing in common

with the Russian koza.

Egorov needn't have referred to the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Kara-Kalpak teke at all, if ečki, a word current in the Turkic languages, has not been included.

On page 95, as well, after listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kašăk 'spoon', he did not indicate that this word has been taken into the Chuvash language from Tatar dialects.

Egorov has compared the Chuvash word kăvakal 'duck' with the Bashkir and Tatar kügel, as well as the Kirgiz kögöl 'drake'. This comparison, known for a long time, was established by Paasonen. Yet, the author was not completely satisfied with this comparison, and suggested that this word might be traced back to an onomatopoeic kva kva, in imitation of the duck's quack.

The Turkic languages have some bird-names going back to onomatopes, such as the Turkish ibibik, karga, saksagan... Yet, it hardly seems probable that the Chuv. kăvakal should prove to be such an onomatope.

The word kăvakal means 'duck' in Chuvash. The current meaning of the above-mentioned Bashkir, Tatar, and Kirgiz forms is 'drake'. It is well-known that, in the dialects of Anatolia, the Turkish gövel means a 'green-headed duck'. I argued in an article of mine (1958) treating the words derived from the Turkish word gök

'sky'. Besides the word gövel 'duck', the word yeşilbaş 'drake' is also used by the Turks of Anatolia. Thus, the word kögöl (~ kügel), common in Turkic languages, may be used with the meaning 'drake', anyway. Among the derivatives of the Turkic gök, several bird-names can be found. It will suffice to mention the Turkish word güvercin (Chuv. kāvakarčān 'pigeon'). It is evident that this word is a derivative of the Turkish stem gök (Chuv. kāvak). The Chuvash word kāvakarčān has been explained by Egorov, too, in terms of kāvak. Consequently, the Chuvash word kāvakal 'duck' cannot supposed to be an onomatope.

D.S.Setarov (1970, p.89) states that the Russian gogol' is a loan-word adopted into Russian from Turkish. Equally, F.P.Filin (1962, p.210) takes this word for an onomatope.

On page 97, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kāvar 'a live coal from a fire, embers', Egorov also gives the Turkish form kor 'a live coal'. It is well-known that both kor and köz are forms in use in Anatolia. In the form köz, this word is also represented in the Altai dialects. In some of these dialects, the form kos occurs, as well. It is obvious that the latter goes back to the form koz.

In addition to köz, another form, kor is employed in Turkish. This form has long been connected with the

word qoz (> qos), current in the Turkic languages. In this respect, Egorov was quite right to group both kor and köz with the cognates of the Chuv. kăvar. Yet, Egorov has not confined himself to including the above-mentioned forms under this heading, he has also added the Turkmen hovur 'heat', the Turkish kavur-, the Uzbek kovur-, and some other like words.

There is no connection whatever between the Turkic words köz (~ qoz) ~ gor and qavur-. Thus, it was wrong of Egorov to include the word kavur- under this heading.

Right at the end, Egorov states that this Turkic word is an old loan-word from Persian.

The Turkic form raises several problems that should be discussed: which is the older form, koz (~ köz), current in Turkic languages or kor, represented in the dialects of Anatolia and the Balkans? Again, is there any connection between the Turkic word köz (~ qoz) and the Teleut kō 'soot'? Can any connection be supposed between the above-mentioned words and the stem köy- (~ küy-) 'to burn'? Couldn't the Turkish word kömür 'coal' be derived from that stem? As long as we have no answers to these questions, it will be a difficult problem to enter into etymological arguments.

At the end of the entry, Egorov, has also added the stem küy- (~ köy-) 'to burn', current in Turkic lan-

guages.

On page 97, Egorov has given as a cognate of the Chuvash word kăykăr 'falcon', the Bashkir word qıyır 'harrier (for hunting hens)' alone. Yet, this word is represented in several Turkic languages in the form qırçıy 'hawk'. Consequently, The Chuv. kăykăr is a metathetical variant for the word qırçıy. The metathesis in this word may be supported by the instance of the Turkish word toygar 'lark'. The old form of the word torgay is represented in several Turkic languages. In J. Németh's view (1943, p. 101), even the Hung. karvaly (Turkic qırçıy) may be considered a Turkic loan-word.

On page 100, when discussing the Chuvash word kărkka 'turkey', notice may have been taken of the Turkish word gurk (~ kurk), too. In Turkish, this word means both 'turkey cock' and 'brood-hen'. In the Anatolian dialects, forms like gurk- (~ kurk) are used together with gürk- (~ kürk), gulk, guluk (~ kuluk), güllük (~ küllük), küllük, etc. In Anatolia, the forms culuk (~ cüllük) culluk, çuluk, etc. have been adopted, as well.

On page 101, under kăsamăk 'measles', Egorov has derived the Turkic qızamıq from qızıl amaq!

This is a bad etymology without any serious foundation. The author has admitted under this heading that the Chuv. kăsamăk is a Tatar loan-word; he has even record-

ed the Old Chuvash a cognate of the word qizamïq (xěrlěxen). It is characteristic of the entire dictionary that Egorov, treating words borrowed from Tatar, does not indicate this explicitly. The Tatar words must be indicated as such - as under this heading - otherwise those unacquainted with phonetical characteristics of the Chuvash language may not easily recognize this fact.

On page 105, under kěntěk 'navel', Hung. köldök 'navel', may have been added to the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Tatar data (Z. Gombocz, 1912, pp. 103-104).

Paasonen compared the Chuvash word kěpe 'shirt' with the word kübe 'armour'. On pages 105-106, when listing the Turkic cognates of the word kěpe, Egorov has added to the kübe the Turkish kab, kap, the Altai and Shor kep, the Khakass kip 'example, pattern', the Nogay qapčiq, the Tatar qapčiq, the Uzbek qop, qopčiq 'sack', the Turkish kebe 'cloak', etc. -yet there is no connection whatever between these words and the Chuv. kěpe. The Turkish word kap cannot be connected with the Chuv. kěpe, either in terms of phonetics or in those of semantics. The word kep 'example', as pointed out above, is a cognate of the Chuv. kap. Thus, the word kep need not have been included under kěpe.

As to the Turkish word kebe, in Anatolia this word has taken another form, as well, kepe. In A. Tietze's

view (1955, p.223, item 109), the form kebe has been adopted into Turkish from Armenian (gaba), and the form kepe from Greek. Consequently, the Turkish word kebe cannot be classed among the cognates of the Chuv. kěpe.

On page 109, when listing the cognates of the Chuvash word kěru < kěřev 'bridegroom', the author has added the Azerbaijani word küreken and the Turkmen word köreken to the forms küdegü, küvegü, küyö, küyö, küyü, küze, kütüö, güvey, etc.

At first sight, it seems that the word küreken (~ köreken) and the Chuvash word kěru (< kěřev) are very much alike in terms of phonetics and those of semantics. This likeness, however, is misleading. This word and the Chuv. kěru have nothing in common, because küreken (~ köreken) has been borrowed into the Turkic languages from Mongolian (Mong. kürgen > küregen 'bridegroom'). Therefore, the word küreken (~ köreken) cannot be classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. kěru.

At present, the origin of the Turkish güvey (~ Chuv. kěru < küdegü) is controversial.

On page 110, Egorov has added to the cognates grouped under the Chuvash word kěśśe 'felt' the Turkish (and Turkmen) keçe and other words current in the Turkic languages with the meaning 'felt', kiyiz, kiz, kigiz, kidis etc.

Under this heading, the author has confused two Turkic words, both meaning 'felt'. The Chuv. kěsse can be connected with the Turkish (and Turkmen) words keçe, alone. No connection whatever can be supposed between the Kirgiz, Nogay, Kara-Kalpak, Uzbek forms kiyiz (< kigiz) and the word keče.

On page 111, the author states that he could not find a Turkic counterpart for the Chuvash word kivşen 'debt, loan', the only examples quoted by him are the Hung. kölcsön and the Mong. kölösün on the authority of Z. Gomabocz's work (1912). The Yakut word kölösön 'sweat' has escaped the author's attention.

The Hung. kölcsön was last dealt with by L. Ligeti (1935, pp. 232-33). In his view, the Yakut kölösün is a loan-word from Mongolian (p. 234). In the above paper, Ligeti referred to every Chuvash word borrowed from Mongolian. For that reason, it seems to be a serious shortcoming of not only the above entry, but also of the entire dictionary, that Egorov has taken no notice of Ligeti's work.

The derivation of the Yakut word kölösün (> kölöhtün) from Mongolian has also been adopted by Stanislaw Kałużiński (1961, p. 82).

On p. 112, the Hung. kölyű 'pounder' may have been included under the Chuvash kilě 'large stone or wooden

mortar'. This word is known to be taken into Hungarian from Turkic. (Gombocz, 1912, p.104).

In the Turkic dialects, the word soqu 'stone mortar for pounding' is also represented, as well as this form. In the Anatolian dialects this word was supplanted, except for a small area, by the word dibek. A paper of mine, discussing the derivation of the word dibek is to come out in the near future.

I also propose to treat the Chuv. maksăma 'beer' (p.128). The author has recorded the Kirgiz maqsım 'a drink made from fermented barley without malt' and the Tatar forms maqsıma, maqsım, as the cognates of the Chuvash word; and has presumed that the etymology of the word is unknown. The author may not have noticed my contribution to the Körösi Csoma Archivum (1941-43, pp. 130-132).

On page 118, under kunča 'boot-leg or leg of a boot or stocking', the author has derived the Turkic word qonč from the stem kön 'coarse leather'. I am convinced that no connection whatever can be supposed between the Turkic words qonč and kön (> gön), either in terms of phonetics, or in terms of grammatical structure, or those of semantics.

On page 118, the word kupăs 'violin' is undoubtedly a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 119, the matter of the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. kurāk 'grass' is controversial. It is understandable that Egorov, too, had serious difficulties in treating the subject. The author has recorded the Turkish word koruk as a cognate of the Chuv. kurāk. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to connect the Chuv. kurāk with the word koruk 'unripe grape'.

On page 120, the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kuś 'eye', such as the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Nogay, Karachay-Balkar köz, Turkmen, Turkish göz, etc. have been cited by Egorov. The counterpart of the common Turkic sound -z is -r in Chuvash, as in Turkish sekiz ~ Chuv. sakkār, sakār 'eight', Turkish dokuz Chuv. ~ tāxxār, tāxār 'nine', Turkish semiz ~ Chuv. samār 'fat', etc. The Chuvash form kuś is the most closely related to the common Turkic köz, in terms of phonetics. Therefore, Egorov should have indicated that the Chuvash form kuś is a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 122, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. kül- 'to drive (animals)', he has added the Turkish koş-, Kara-Kalpak koş-, Turkmen goş-, etc. to the word köl-, current in the Turkic languages; though no phonetical relation can be supposed between them. Thus, it is wrong to connect the stems koş- and köl-.

As to the Chuv. măyăx 'moustache', on page 130,

it is evident that this is a loan-word from Tatar. The author has not made this fact quite clear, just as he has failed to give details in other places.

On page 148, the subject of the cognates of the Chuv. pări 'buckwheat' is a difficult one. Egorov has given the Bashkir and Tatar boray 'buckwheat', the Turkish, Turkmen buğday, the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak biday, etc. as cognates and he has added that the word is also represented in the Indo-European languages.

The Chuv. pări has also been treated by J. Benzing (1944). Benzing regarded the Tatar form boray as a Chuvash loan-word (p.26).

On page 155, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. pëve 'to paint', the author has failed to mention that this word has been adopted into Chuvash from a neighbouring language. As this word is derivative of the Turkic form boda-, we should infer a form containing an -r- in Chuvash. The Chuvash form pëve can be derived from the stem buya- (< boya-).

On page 166, the author has traced back the Chuvash form purśän 'silk' from the word barčın, yet he has failed to mention the Hung. bársony 'velvet', borrowed from Turkic. A study of the Hung. bársony was made by Z. Gombocz. In Gombocz's works (1927 and 1928), several interesting instances can be found con-

cerning the stem of the word pursān.

When listing the Turkic cognate of the Chuv. pus 'head', the author has failed to mention that this word has been taken into Chuvash from Tatar. Yet, it is obvious that this word does not bear the mark of being a Chuvash word. On the evidence of the Turkish taş, ~Chuv. čul or the Turkish gümüş (< kümüş) ~Chuv. kēmēl, etc., a form pul may be inferred to exist in Chuvash as a cognate of the Turkic word baş (> paš, pas) Consequently, the Chuvash form pus has to be traced back to Tatar.

On page 173, under pil 'honey', Egorov has confined himself to recording the principal Turkic cognates of this word. In recent years, much has been written about the derivation of the Turkish word bal 'honey'. Egorov may not have noticed these papers.

Also on page 173, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. pilčak 'mud', Egorov has recorded the following forms: the Turkish, Kirgiz, Tatar balčiq, Turkmen palčiq, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay balčiq, Bashkir balsiq, Altai palčaq, palčaq, etc. The Chuvash form pilčak is obviously a derivative from one of the neighbouring languages.

Egorov has not dealt with the derivation of the Turkish balçık. In one of my former papers contributed to the Türkiyat Mecmuası, I derived the word balçık from the stem balq. (This contribution was also published in German.

in Ural-altaische Jahrbücher.) The author has not come to hear of these, either.

On page 174, the Chuv. saväl 'dagger, wedge' has been connected by Egorov with the word siŋis 'dagger, wedge', current in the Altai dialects. This allows us to suppose that, in the author's view, the word siŋis goes back to the form ^xsiŋis. In my opinion, however, it is easier to compare the Chuv. saväl with sigil, a word represented in the Anatolian dialects (Ankara, Kastamonu, Kütahya), meaning "an iron or wooden wedge for cutting up big blocks of wood, hard to chop, by placing it in a slit made by the axe". In Anatolia, besides the word sigil other forms are also used such as siyil 'iron or wooden wedge for cutting wood' (Kütahya, Zonguldak, Bolu, Çanakkale, Sivas) and singil (Zonguldak).

The stem of the Turkic siŋil (siyil, singil) is not known. This word obviously goes back to very old times. Therefore, it can quite easily be connected with the Chuvash form saväl.

On page 174, the author has failed to mention that the Chuv. sazan 'carp' is a loan-word from Tatar. We know that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -z- is -r- in Chuvash. Consequently, a form ^xsuran should be inferred to exist in Chuvash. For this reason, the Chuv. sazan is obviously a loan-word from Tatar.

The entry under savăt 'vessel, pot' is also to be corrected. The Chuv. savăt is known to be related to the words savut ~ savīt 'id.', current in the Turkic languages. (Cf. H. Paasonen 1908.) Egorov, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. savăt, has added the word sepet to the words savut ~ savīt: Turkish sepet, Turkmen sebet, Uzbek savat 'basket', etc. At the end of the entry, he has observed that this word is "presumably a loan-word from Persian".

The Turkish sepet (Turkmen sebet, etc.) are known to be loan-words from Persian. However, it is wrong of the author to compare the Turkic word savut ~ savīt with the Persian sepet, disregarding the difference in meaning. This comparison, based on similarity in sounding alone, is incorrect.

On page 175, he has given the Turkish form seki as the only cognate of the Chuv. sakāl, sakālta 'step'. Yet, in the Turkic languages, the form sekil is in use, as well as seki.

On page 177, he has compared the Chuv. salma 'flour paste' with the Tat. salma and the Bashk. halma. On this evidence, it is obvious that the Chuv. salma is a loan-word from Tatar.

An example in point of Egorov's working method is the entry under sukkār 'blind', on page 193. On analyzing

the Chuv. sukkār, the author has added the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay soqır, Tat. suqır, Bashk. huqır, etc. to the Turkish kör. Egorov has adopted the view, that there is an etymological connection between the Turkic words kör and soqur, adding however that kör is 'presumably' a loan-word from Persian.

The Turkic kör is undoubtedly a loan-word from Persian. For that reason, it is wrong to compare the words soqur and kör (> qor, qur).

The Turkic counterpart of the Chuvash word śamrāk 'young', on page 202, is not known. The only word to which it bears phonetical and semantic resemblance, is the Hung. gyermek 'child'. M. Räsänen (1920) was the first to propose the derivation of the Hung. gyermek from Turkic. Z. Gombocz, when reviewing Räsänen's work (1921, p. 84) took the position that this word was not in use in any other language except Chuvash. L. Rásonyi (1966), took up the subject of a connection between the Chuv. śamrāk and the Hung. gyermek.

On page 205, the author has classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. śākān- 'to kneel', the word yūkūn- 'to kneel', as well as the stem čök- (~ čūk-). The author has incorrectly connected the Chuvash form with the verb čök-.

Egorov has recorded the word yul 'brook, spring'

among the cognates of the Chuv. śāl 'spring, fountain, well' (p.206). This word is known to be a very old one in the Turkic languages, cf. Pelliot (1930a), Sinor (1964). The word čil 'river' is current even in the present-day Turkic languages. Nevertheless, the form čulye, represented in the Azeri dialects, cannot be compared with the Chuv. śāl, either in terms of phonetics or in those of semantics.

Under this heading, Egorov has also grouped the Turkish and Gagauz words kuyu as cognates of the Chuv. śāl. This word is known to go back to the form quduq. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the Chuv. śāl with the Turkic form kuyu (< quduq).

On page 207, Egorov has connected the Chuv. śānǎx 'flour' with the Turkic word un, without mentioning that the Turkic un is a loan-word from Chinese. The author may have been unaware of the existence of the papers on this subject. To my knowledge, P. Pelliot (1922, p.177) was the first to suppose the Turkic un to be a loan-word from Chinese. L. Ligeti (1938, p.192) and M. Räsänen (1949, pp.87 and 189) connected this word with the Korean (in Ligeti's work: Sino-Korean) word pun. In G. J. Ramstedt's view (1932, p.246) the Korean pun has been borrowed from Chinese. A. J. Joki (1952, pp.366-367) also adopted the view that the Korean pun is a derivative from Chinese. He made, however, certain reservations concerning the

Chinese derivation of the Turkic word un. In his view, this word can also be traced back to the Turkic stem oğ- (ov-, uv-, u-). The derivation of the word un from the stem uv- was earlier proposed by W. Bang, as well (1918-19, pp. 14-15). M. Räsänen (1969, p. 514) derived the word un directly from the stem uğ-. G. Clauson stated under un (p. 166) that this word is represented in all present-day Turkic languages; however, he failed to mention the Chuvash form śānăx.

On page 209, the author has accounted for the word śeśen by deriving it from the Chuvash stem śeś- 'to bloom, to flower'. This word is represented in a good many Turkic languages besides Chuvash (čečen 'eloquent'). This word is of Mongolian origin; for this reason, it cannot be traced back to the stem śeś-.

When enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word śěvě 'seam' (p. 209), Egorov has added the Uzbek čeq to the Bashkir word yöy, and the Tat. čöy. Because of phonetic differences, it would be difficult to compare the Uzbek word čeq with the other instances, grouped under this heading.

At the end of the entry, the author has recorded the Kirgiz word tik- 'to sew'. This word could have no connection with the form śěvě.

On the other hand, it would have been advisable to

include the Hung. szűcs 'furrier'. It is well-known that the Hung. szűcs is a derivation of the Chuvash form šěvēšē (Gombocz, 1912, p. 126).

On page 209, we find included the Kirgiz word šoqir, in addition to the Tatar, Bashkir, and Turkmen cognates of the Chuvash word čëkë 'sturgeon'. It would be better to omit the latter word, which bears no resemblance to the word čöke (> čëkë).

On page 212, the author has grouped together the Turkic cognates of the word šërě 'ring'. It has been a mistake to class the Yakut word dörö 'ring' among the Turkic cognates of the word. The Yakut dörö (~ törö) is a loan-word from Mongolian (Kažužynski, 1961, p. 96).

Reference may have been made to the Hungarian word gyűrű 'ring', too. An excellent paper was written about the derivation of the Turkic yüzük (~ Hung. gyűrű) by L. Ligeti (1958). Of course, the author could not know of the existence of this paper.

On page 214, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. širěk 'alder', Egorov has added the Tatar form zirek (zirik) to the words current in Kazakh, Bashkir, and other Turkic languages. The author has adopted the Tatar form zirek from Budagov (Budagov: zirik). It is known, however, that in the Tatar language there is a synonymous word yirěk besides the form zirek (Paasonen,

1897, p. 48, and 1903, p. 27). I am not sure, whether there is any connection between the Tatar forms zirek and yirĕk. There can be no doubt, however, that the Chuvash form širĕk is a cognate of the Tatar yirĕk. Even the Karachay form Yerk, quoted by the author, is a cognate of yirĕk. At the end of the entry under širĕk, Egorov has given the Yakut word sihik ~ sisik. I would suggest, however, that he should have analysed the connection between the Yakut sihik (sisik) and the word yirĕk, in terms of phonetics.

It would have been useful to mention, at the end of the entry, that a connection can be established between the Hung. gyŕd 'Acer tartarium' and the Chuv. širĕk (Z. Gombocz, 1912, p. 83).

On page 214, Egorov has listed the cognate of the Chuv. šimĕš 'fruit': Turkish yemiş, Uzbek, Kirgiz yemiş, Nogay emis, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak Yemis, etc. Moreover, he has added the Turkish word yem 'fodder', but he has not studied the connection between yemiş and yem. The Chuv. šimĕš is evidently a derivation from the stem ši- 'to eat'. Yet, an important trait of the word has escaped the author's attention. It is well-known that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -ŷ (and -š-) is -l (and -l-) in Chuvash, as in Turkish altmış 'sixty' ~ Chuv. utmāl, Turkish yetmiş 'seventy' ~ Chuv. šitmĕl, Turkish gümüş ~ Chuv. kĕmĕl, Turkish kış

Chuv. xěl, Turkish beğ ~ Chuv. pillěk, etc. Consequently, we ought to find the form ^xśiměl in Chuvash as a counterpart of the Turkish yemiğ. Therefore, the form śiměś cannot be regarded as normal.

Egorov has spoken of the Hungarian loan-words from Old Chuvash in several parts of his dictionary. Under this heading, it would also have been useful to consider the Hungarian word gyümölcs 'fruit' when writing the history of the Chuvash word śiměś. Z. Gombocz (1912, pp. 81-2), traced the Hungarian word gyümölcs back to the Chuvash form ^xŷimiś. Yet, it is well-known that in the Hungarian words adopted from Old Turkic the Turkic sounds -ŷ (and -ŷ-) have been replaced by -l (and -l-), as in Turkic tŷŷ ~ Hung. dél 'noon, South'. Therefore, the sound cs [č] in the Hungarian word gyümölcs has to be accounted for. The Mongolian form ŷimis is a loan-word from Turkic.

We know that the Chuv. śirěm 'twenty', on page 214, can be traced back to the Turkic word yirmi (< yigirmi). Egorov, after enumerating a number of forms in use in Old and present-day Turkic languages, has suggested that the word is a compound of the Chuv. yěķer 'twins' ~ Turkic ikiz plus the suffix -ma, -măŷ 'ten'. Linguists have long entertained the idea that the Turkic yirmi (< yigirmi) is a derivation of the numeral

iki (yiki). G. J. Ramstedt may be quoted as an example. Ramstedt argued that yigirmi was formed by adding the Mong. arban 'ten' to the Turkic yiki (\sim iki). Ramstedt's suggestion needs careful consideration. Egorov, however, could not quote any other of the old etimologies of the word besides Ramstedt's explanation.

As to Egorov's suggestion, we know nothing of the existence of a suffix -ma \sim (-mäš) 'ten' in Chuvash. The name for number ten in Chuvash is yun (\sim Turkish on). The suffix -mäš (\sim -ma), recorded by Egorov, is only putative. I would suggest that the author has proposed these forms by having in mind the Chuvash words šitměl 'seventy' (\sim Turkish yetmiş) and utmäl 'sixty' (\sim Turkish altmış). The Turkic words altmış and yetmiş, in fact, go back to the stems alfi 'six' and yeti 'seven'. By analogy with the Turkic numerals seksen ($<$ sekiz on) and doksan ($<$ dokuz on), attempts were made to explain the words altmış and yetmiş in terms of a compound, consisting of the elements alfi and -miş, yeti ($>$ yedi) and -miş. The suffix -miş (or -miş) can easily be supposed to have the meaning 'ten' in these forms. The more so, as in Turkic languages the forms altan ($<$ alton $<$ alfi on) and yetten ($<$ yetton, $<$ yetti on, yeti on) are also used for altmış and yetmiş. On the evidence of the Turkic words altmış and yetmiş, it can



be argued that Turkic once had a suffix -miš (or -miš) with the meaning 'ten'. In Ramstedt's view (1907, p. 16), the -miš (~ -miš) in the words altmiš and yetmiš, is a deverbal suffix. J. Németh (1942-47, p. 82) who had studied the Uralic counterparts of the suffix -miš (~ -miš), found that the sound -š at the end of the suffix -miš (~ -miš) went back to a sound -s. ("Das türkische -š geht meines Erachtens auf ursprüngliches -s zurück"). I think that this view of Németh's cannot be adopted without careful consideration. On the evidence of the Chuvash form utmal and šitmēl, altmiš and yetmiš are the only forms to be inferred in Turkish.

On page 216, Egorov, in addition to comparing the Chuv. šul 'year' with the Yakut sil, the Turkish, Turkmen, Nogay, Bashkir yil, etc., has also added the word yaš 'age, time of life of a person', current in Turkic languages. Up to the present, no connection could be found between the Turkic yil and yaš. In terms of semantics, the two words are obviously close to each other. Nevertheless, in terms of phonetics, the similarity of the two words has to be considered with reservation. For this reason, only the word yil must have been recorded under this heading as a cognate of a Chuvash word.

On page 220, the Turkish yağrın may be added to the cognates of the Chuvash word šurām. Moreover, a

previous paper of L. Rásonyi's might have been mentioned (1934). In this paper, Rásonyi attempted to prove the Turkic derivation of the Hung. szárny 'wing'.

On page 221, under śurta 'candle', the Hung. gyertya might have been included (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 78-80).

On page 224, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. śir- 'to write', the author had added the Yakut suruy- 'to write' and suruk 'writing' to the form yaz- (> Yaz-). The Yakut suruy- and suruk are loan-words from Mongolian (See Kałuziński, 1961, pp. 23, 47, 125). Therefore, it was erroneous of the author to give Yakut references in support of that word. On the other hand, the Hung. ír- 'to write' should have been included (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 87-88).

The entry under the Chuv. śilăx 'guilt', on page 225, also needs correcting. Egorov has mistakenly grouped the Altai d'azik 'error, guilt, crime' (Verbickij) among the cognates of the word. In terms of meaning, nothing can be said against the comparison. Seen, however, from the point of view of phonetics, the Chuv. śilăx cannot be compared with the Altai d'azik (Turkish yazık). As a Chuvash counterpart of the Turkish yazık a form containing an -r- ^{x'}śirăk may be inferred. The author has argued that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -z- within this word is a Chuvash -l-. As far as

I know, no other such example can be found in Chuvash. For this reason, we cannot compare the Chuvash word šilăx with the Turkish yazık.

In my opinion, the Chuvash šilăx may be compared with the Kipchak ilik 'guilt': ilik <^xyilik> šilăx. This word, occurring in Et-Tuhfet, was connected by T. Halasi-Kun (1947, p.25), too, with the Chuv. šilăx.

On page 226, Egorov has grouped into the cognates of the Chuv. širla 'fruit', the Tat. žilek, the Bashk. yelek, the Turkish çilek, the Uighur yemiš, the Khakas žistek, all meaning 'fruit'. In addition to giving these references, the author has argued that this word is a derivation of the Uighur stem ye- 'to eat', while tracing back the word elek to the form ^xed-lek.

This entry needs correction on more than one account. First, to compare the Uighur yemiš with the Chuv. širla is mistaken. The word yemiš has long been current in the Turkic languages and is known to exist in Chuvash, too (šiměš). It is totally wrong to connect the Turkish çilek with the Chuv. širla.

Coming to the Chuv. šitar, šătar 'pillow', on page 226, Egorov has enumerated the following cognates: Uighur yastuq, Turkish yastık, Turkmen yassıq, Kirgiz, Kazakh yasfiq, Kara-Kalpak dasfiq, Nogay yastıq, Tatar yasfiq, Yakut sittiq, etc. He has added to all these that the Chuvash, Yakut, Uighur, Uzbek, and Turkmen forms

can presumably be the derivatives of the stem yat- 'to lie down' (Chuv. ^xšit-, Yakut sit-, Turkish, Turkmen, Tatar, etc. yat-). In the author's view, the word yasfiq was formed from the form yasfiq by dissimilation. And the Yakut form sittiq, where dissimilation did not take place, would be the direct counterpart of the word yatfiq.

Egorov has traced back the Chuv. šitar, šatar to the stem yat- (~ Chuv. ^xšit-), yet he has not discussed the grammatical structure of the form šitar.

Having said this by way of explanation, he has added at the end of the entry that the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, etc. word yasfiq goes back to the stem yasta-.

On this evidence, we may point out that the author has contradicted himself in the entry: in the first part he has explained the yasfiq in terms of the stem yat-, in the second part he has derived it from yasta-.

On page 236, the Chuv. tälmač 'interpreter' is taken for a loan-word from Tatar (tilmač). The Turkic word filmač was last dealt with by P. Jyrkänkallio (1952) and J. Németh (1958).

On page 239, notice should have been taken of the Turkish form toygat besides the words torgay (~ turgay) among the cognates of the Chuv. täri 'lark, crested lark'

On page 244, under tëve 'camel', the Hung. teve has been omitted (Gombocz, 1912, p. 129), just as under

täkär 'mirror' the Hung. tükör has not been mentioned (Gombocz, 1912, p.134). It would have been of interest to include temegen, the Mongolian cognate of the Turkish word deve (< teve).

Under the Chuv. täněl 'axle', on page 246, the Hung. tengely might have been mentioned Gombocz (1912, p.128).

On page 259, after listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. tură 'God', the author has added the Sumerian dingir 'firmament'. As formerly expounded by B.Landsberger (1942, p.96), no connection can be supposed between the Sumerian dingir and the Turkish tengri (> tanrı) 'God'

On page 267, under tüs- 'to push, to endure', the author has failed to mention that the Turkic forms töz- (~ tüz-) have been borrowed from Tatar. Yet, on the evidence of the Hung. tűr-, a Chuvash form ^xtör- seems to have existed (Gombocz, 1912, pp.134-135).

On page 268, the author has classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. fina 'young bullock' the word dönen, too. This word is known to be of Mongolian derivation. For that reason, it would be wrong to compare the Turkish tana (> dana), and the Turkic word of Mongolian derivation dönen. The Hung. tinó 'young bullock' might also have been included under this heading (Gombocz, 1912, p.130).

On page 273, under ulma (~ Turkish alma 'apple'), Egorov has explained the etymology of the word alma. He made use of an older work by B. Munkácsi, though several papers on the origin of that word have been published recently.

On page 275, grouped into the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. urǎ 'sober', the Altai erül 'sober' has been added by Egorov to the Turkic forms ayık (and ayuk). That word of undoubtedly Mongolian origin need not have been recorded under this heading.

On page 275, he has compared the Chuv. uram 'road' with the Turkic form uram (~ oram). He should have indicated that this word is a loan-word from Mongolian.

On page 276, the Kirgiz, Turkmen arča, Uzbek karaarča, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak arša need not have been included among the cognates of the Chuv. urtăş 'juniper' Turkish ardıç, Altai, Tatar, Bashkir artış, etc.

On pages 291-292, the word xămăş, xumăş 'reed' is a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 293, after listing the cognates of the Chuv. xăntăr 'beaver', Egorov maintains that the Turkic qunduz 'beaver' is a derivative from Arabic. This word is known to have existed in Turkic for a very long time,

therefore it cannot be supposed to be derived from Arabic. In J. Németh's opinion (1942-1947, p. 76), the Turkic gunduz may be compared with the Hung. hód 'beaver (castor, fiber, lutra)'. The Hung. hód has cognates in the Ugric languages, as well.

On pages 294-295, he has registered both the word kün and the word qırqın among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xărxăm. The Chuvash form xărxăm must obviously go back to the word qırqın. For this reason, the Old Turkic word kün need not have been included under this heading.

As to the Chuvash word xěvel 'sun', Egorov has compared it with the word quyaş (> qoyaş) in common use in the Turkic languages. He has added to that that the word quyaş is a derivation of the Turkic stem küy-, köy- 'to burn' (p. 297).

In terms of phonetics, nothing can be said against the connection of the Chuv. xěvel with the Common Turkic quyaş. It has long been known that the Chuv. xěvel goes back to the word quyaş. What is new, however, is the derivation of the Turkic word quyaş from the stem küy-, köy-. No connection whatever can be supposed between the word quyaş and the stem küy-, köy-, either in terms of vocalism, or consonantism.

Egorov has grouped the following forms into the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xeser 'barren': the Kirgiz,

Kara-Kalpak, Uzbek, Kumyk, Tatar, Bashkir qisır, Turkmen gisır, etc. (p. 300). In Egorov's view, the Chuv. xėsěr was formed from a hypothetical ^x xěrsěr 'not having a daughter' (Chuv. xěr ~ Turkish qız with the suffix -sěr ~ -sız). To suppose the etymology, the author has referred to the Mong. kegüser (küser).

When suggesting this explanation, it was the Chuvash form alone that the author had had in mind. Yet, this word is known to be represented in all of the Turkic languages. On the authority of Egorov's etymology, we would infer that we would find the form ^x qızsız in the Turkic languages. But the above-cited instance proves that the authors solution cannot be agreed with because of the other Turkic references. Perhaps the authors may have had the idea that the Turkic qisır was a derivation from Chuvash I cannot tell. There are several words in Chuvash borrowed from the neighbouring Turkic languages. In this respect, N. Poppe's paper (1927a) containing essential information, may be cited. The opposite case is also known, viz. a good many Chuvash words have been adopted into the Tatar, Mishar, and Bashkir languages. It is only from languages as far away from Chuvash as Turkish, Turkmen or Kara-Kalpak that Chuvash words are absent. After studying these instances, the solution proposed by Egorov would be hard to agree with. The same is N.

Poppe's opinion.

On page 302, the author has registered the Turkish form kaygı as a cognate of the Chuv. xuyxă 'anxiety'. Then he added that the Turkic qayğı (< qadyu) 'to burn' goes back to the stem küy-, köy-.

The Turkish kaygı was qadyu in Old Turkic. And this form cannot be traced back to the stem köy-, either in terms of vocalism or in terms of consonantism.

The Chuvash form xuyxă may be considered a loan-word from Tatar (qayğı) because of the -y- within the word (N. Poppe, 1927a, p. 155).

The Chuv. xuran 'cauldron', on page 307, is known to be a derivation of the Turkic qazan (~ qazyan). Of the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xuran, Egorov has registered the Khakass ɣazan, the Turkish, Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay, Tatar, Bashkir qazan, the Turkmen gazan. In addition to these, the Gagauz word ɣaran is also considered by the author as a cognate of the Chuvash word.

The phonetical and semantical similarity between the Gagauz ɣaran and the Turkish kazan (< qazyan) is evident at first sight. Still, despite this similarity, the Gagauz ɣaran cannot be compared with the Turkish kazan.

The Gagauz ɣaran is of Turkic derivation. This word is represented in the dialects of Anatolia and of the Balkans in the form harani (> harani). The form hereni,

occurring in various parts of Anatolia, goes back to this latter form, as well. The Turkish harani (> harānī) is known to be of Persian derivation (Persian harānī). Therefore, between the Turkish kazan and the vernacular harani no connection can be posited. An evident example of this is that the word kazan is also represented in the Gagauz language.

The Turkish harani was adopted into the languages of the Balkans, it can be found in Bulgarian, Serbian, and Romanian. Fifty years ago, a Bulgarian linguist attempted to trace back this word to Old Bulgarian. I pointed out that this statement was without any foundation whatsoever (Rodna Reč XV, 1941, pp. 81-82).

On the evidence of the above instances, I would argue that no chance of comparing the Gagauz varan with the Turkish kazan (~ Chuv. xuran) has been left.

Ivan Duridanov, in his work, published in 1960 (Stari tjurski zaemki v bŕlgarski ezik. Issledovanija v ŕest na Marin S. Drinov, Sofia 1960, pp. 429-445), discussed the derivation of the Bulgarian charanija. Unfortunately, I could not get access to Duridanov's paper in Ankara.

On page 308, the author has listed the cognates of the Chuv. xurŕn 'beech tree': the Uzbek gayin, Kazakh gayŕn, Kara-Kalpak gayŕn, Nogay, Bashkir gayŕn, Turkmen

yayin, Sagai, Shor qazın, Tuva yadın, Khakass yazın, Yakut yafın. On this evidence, this word can be traced back to the form ^xqadın. Thus, these forms cannot be compared with the Mong. yus(an).

The Chuv. xurāntaš, on page 308, has been taken into Chuvash from the neighbouring Turkic languages, as observed by Egorov, as well (< qarındaš 'brother'). As the Turkic qarındaš is a derivation of the stem qarın (~ Chuv. xirām, in the author's view, a form xirāmtaš ought to have been borrowed into Chuvash).

The Chuvash counterpart of the Turkic qarın is xirām. Yet, on the evidence of the Turkish altmıš Chuv. utmāl, Turkish yetmiš, Chuv. šitměl, Turkish gümüş (< kümüš) ~ Chuv. kēměl, I would argue that a form like xirāmtaš can hardly be an original Chuvash counterpart of the Turkic qarındaš. We would better adopt the view that the Chuvash form xirāmtaš was borrowed from Tatar. N. Poppe (1927a, p. 155) also derived the Chuv. xurāntaš from Tatar.

On page 309, the author has compared the Chuv. xurlāxan 'red currant' with the Tat. qorlığan 'red currant' and with the Kazakh qarlığan 'gooseberry'. Moreover, he has included under this heading the Kirgiz, Bashkir qaraŋat, Uzbek qoraŋat 'black currant', though these words have nothing in common with the Chuv.

xurlăxan.

On page 314, he has taken the Turkish haber, the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay, Turkmen habar, Kirgiz qabar for loan-words from Arabic, under the Chuv. xipar 'news'. The Hung. hír might also have been grouped under this heading. Gombocz (1912, pp.83-84) agreed with the derivation of the Hung. hír from Turkic. Still, in recent years, Hungarian linguists have thought the Turkish derivation of this word controversial.

On page 314, the author has recorded the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xirâm 'abdomen' (karın, garın, xarın, etc.). In recent years, attempts have been made to explain the Bulgarian korem by deriving it from Turkic (E.Boev, 1965a, p.11).

The Turkish çadır (~ Chuv. čatăr), on page 318, is a derivative from Persian, in Egorov's view. This word has long been supposed to be of Persian origin. In J.Németh's opinion (1953, p.14), however, this word is a genuine Turkic word. On discussing the etymology of the Turkic čadır (čafir), Egorov should have taken Németh's opinion into consideration.

Then, for the history of the Chuv. čatăr, it would have been useful if the author had known of the Turkic origin of the Hung. sátor. The Turkic sound č- changed to ś- in Chuvash. Consequently, the Chuvash form čatăr

has recently been adopted from Tatar (Tat. Ȳatır).

The Chuv. Ȳăna 'fly' is known to be derived from the Turkish sinek. When listing the cognates of the word, Egorov has added the following words to the word sinek: Uzbek sunā, Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak sono, Yellow Uighur sona 'gadfly, forest fly', Nogay sona 'wasp'. It was unjustifiable to compare these words with the Turkish sinek.

The Turkish sinek was taken into Hungarian, too (szúnyog 'mosquito'). The word szúnyog was analyzed phonetically and semantically by L. Ligeti (1935a).

On page 335, Egorov states that he has not been able to find in Turkic a counterpart for the Chuv. Ȳirśa 'bead'. As to me, I would suggest that the Chuv. Ȳirśa should be compared with the Turkish sırça.

Also on page 335, under the Chuv. Ȳărt 'bristle', the Hung. serte (~ sörte) 'bristle' should have been taken into account (Gombocz, 1912, p. 117). As cognates the following words were also recorded by Gombocz: the Tatar Ȳirt 'bristles' (Budagov) and the Teleut Ȳirke, Ȳirkek (Verbickij).

On page 335, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. Ȳărka 'nit', Egorov has confused the Turkish sirke with a Turkish word of Persian derivation sirke 'vinegar'. At the end of the entry, he has also included the Persian

word sirka.

Sirke 'nit, egg of louse' is a Turkic word. It is well-known that the Hung. serke is also a loan-word from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 116-117). This word (sirke) cannot be compared with the word sirke 'vinegar', of Persian origin. It has been erroneous to include the latter word under this heading.

The Chuvash word on page 342 iyxă, iyăx 'sleep' has obviously been taken into Chuvash from one of the neighbouring languages.

On page 346, the Hung. üröm 'vermouth, wormwood' should have been added to the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. erēm 'absinthe' (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 136-137). On the other hand, the Turkmen word evšan 'absinthe' should have been omitted.

On page 347, the author has traced back the Chuv. yulavšă, yulavăs to the Turkic yalavač 'prophet', then he added the words yolavči or yulavči, used in the Turkic languages with the meaning 'passenger'. After listing these data, the author added that these forms were derivatives of the Turkic stem yol (~ yul) 'road'. In my view, however, it would be hard to agree with the derivation of the Turkic yalavač from the stem yol (or yolla-).

On page 355, the word yaš 'young' is a loan-word from Tatar (Tatar yaš).

Here I conclude my review of Egorov's dictionary, despite the fact, that there are many more entries needing correction, supplementing or criticism e.g. Chuv. arpus 'watermelon' (p.32), purăš 'badger' (p.165), sur- 'to spit' (p.196), šăkăr 'bread' (p.205), tapăr 'place where cattle rests and waters at midday' (p.230), tërme 'prison' (p.248), ulput 'owner of a large farm' (p.273), etc.

In a work like this, it is quite natural that mistakes, shortcomings, and errors should occur. And it is particularly the case for an etymological dictionary of a language like the Chuvash.

Etymological dictionaries of a great many Turkic languages have been compiled in recent years. E.g., the Institute for Linguistics of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences published the etymological dictionary of the Kazakh language in 1966. Moreover, Agamusa Ahundov started to publish the historical-etymological dictionary of the Azerbaijani language in 1971. Egorov's dictionary is another important step in that direction. Further on, Turcology would gain much by an etymological dictionary of the Yakut language, as yet unwritten. Stanislaw Kału-žiński's work, Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache, published in 1961, is the first hopeful sign in that direction.

To conclude, I am sure that Egorov's dictionary will be a much used reference work, often consulted in the course of our future Turkological studies.

LOAN-WORDS OF ULTIMATE MIDDLE MONGOLIAN

ORIGIN IN CHUVASH ⁺

by

A. RONA-TAS

The reconstruction of Middle Mongolian is at present, at the centre of research in Mongolian linguistic history. The earliest monuments of the period are from the thirteenth century and some of its features are retained even in copies written in the seventeenth century. Sources of the Middle Mongolian language may be divided into two main groups. Written sources of Mongolian constitute the first group. Naturally, linguistic monuments written in the own script of the Mongols, the so-called Uighur-Mongolian and hP'ags-pa script stand in first place. Chinese written records are also rather significant, e.g. it is well-known the great literary work of the Middle Mongolian period, the Secret History of the Mongols, has come down to us in Chinese transcription and the original text in the Uighur-Mongolian script is lost and only extracts from it survive in another work in Uighur-Mongolian writing. Considerable linguistic material is contained in the Middle Mongolian words recorded in Tibetan, Armenian, Georgian, Persian, Arabic and Latin scripts. An edition of these monuments with internal philological criticism is in an advanced stage

⁺ See Postscript. First published in Hungarian: Középmongol eredetű jövevényszavak a csuvasban; Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae Sectio Ethnographica et Linguistica XV-XVI (1971-1972), pp. 77-88 and XVII-XVIII (1973-1974), pp. 125-141.

and thanks to this work the outlines of the Mongolian language and its dialects are beginning to unfold.

The second group of sources of the Middle Mongolian period consists of the Middle Mongolian loan-words in languages that came into contact with the Mongolian Empire. Papers have been published on the early Mongolian loan-words in the Korean (Pelliot 1930), Yakut (Kałużyński 1961), Cumanian (Poppe 1962), Manchu (Ligeti 1960), and Persian (Doerfer) languages and stray references may be found in literature to Middle Mongolian contacts with other languages as well.¹

A somewhat neglected field of research on the loan-words of the Middle Mongolian period is the study of the Mongolian elements of the Volga Turkic languages, of Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash. The question of the Mongolian parallels naturally did not escape the attention of those who studied the lexicology of the languages of the Volga-region. In the works of Räsänen (1923, 1935, 1937) and Wichmann (1903, 1923-24) written about the Turkic elements of the Volga-Finnish and Permian languages there are several references to Mongolian equivalents of Turkic words. In the works of Zolotnickij (1875) and Paasonen (1908, 1897) on Chuvash lexicology there are also references to Mongolian words. These however only figure as correspondences to Turkic etymologies and the historical connection between

the Turkish and Mongolian data, the chronological and geographic nature of these connections have remained without closer scrutiny.

It is commonly known that two scholars of Mongolian linguistics, Ramstedt and Poppe have written a number of fundamental papers on the history of the Chuvash language. But both of them were only interested in the ancient connections between the Chuvash and the Mongolian languages and any possible late contacts were only occasionally mentioned by them. Ramstedt in his epoch-making work on the situation of the Chuvash language mentions a few international loan-words of Mongolian origin (e. g. bayatur, emneg) but he draws a negative conclusion to the question of the historical contacts of Chuvash and Mongolian: "Es genügt hier klargelegt zu haben, dass das tschuwassische eine regelrechte Entwicklung der Türk-sprache ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen" (1922, p. 34). Here Ramstedt expresses his opposing views primarily against the concept that the ancient Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences had evolved as a consequence of historical contacts, but in the meantime he shies away from the question of their later historical connections.

Poppe adds in his review of Ramstedt's above mentioned work: "In dieser Arbeit gelangt Dr. Ramstedt zu dem Ergebnis, dass das Tschuwassische eine regelrechte Ent-

wicklung des Urtürkischen ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen. Mit dem letzten Teil dieser Behauptung dr. Ramstedts erkläre ich mich für vollständig einverstanden, da es auch meine Überzeugung ist, dass wir im Tschuwassischen keine Spuren irgendeines Einflusses seitens des Mongolischen nachweisen können..." (1924, p. 776). Poppe, in a later work (1927a) already mentions some words of Mongolian origin among the words of the Chuvash languages of Volga Kipchak origin (e.g. quda » Chuv. xāta 'suitor', qabčij » Chuv. xāpcāk 'small pincers', čeber » Chuv. čiper 'good, -decent', ureji » Chuv. ērče- 'to multiply', etc.) but without referring to their age and the circumstances of their assimilation.

The very fact that the question of the loan-words in the Chuvash language of the Middle Mongolian period has hardly emerged, if at all, is well-reflected in Egorov's work (1930), in which the author goes into detail about the Turkic, Arabic, Hebrew, Russian, Finnish (Ugrian), Chinese and Indo-European elements of the Chuvash language but the Mongolian loan-words are not even mentioned.

Ligeti (1935, pp. 268, 271) when dealing with the loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Mongolian epoch, briefly refers to the Mongolian elements of the Volga Kipchak languages, and goes on to say: "Our attention is concentrated mainly on this latter group of Turkic

languages, when we want to consider the Mongolian elements of the Chuvash language. It is an self-evident idea, that the modest number of Mongolian loan and international words in Modern Chuvash can hardly be explained in any other way than the similar elements of e.g. the Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, or Kumyk languages," and later: "In Chuvash there are, and in the Bulgar-Turkic there may have been Mongolian loan and international words; but they are insufficient for considering more enduring Bulgar-Turkic (Chuvash) - Mongolian connections."

Unfortunately, Ligeti's note, published in Hungarian, was not followed by any specialized research. It is true that Egorov (1954) does contain a chapter "Mongolian words in the Chuvash language" (pp. 118-122). Here he divides the Chuvash words with Mongolian parallels into two groups. The words which fall into the first group exist both in the Chuvash and Turkic, as well as in the Mongolian language, and it cannot be decided whether they are of Turkic or Mongolian origin. Egorov classified in the second group words where the Turkic equivalent of the Chuvash word is completely missing or where the Turkic equivalent phonetically or semantically differs from the Chuvash.

According to him, in these cases the Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences originate "not only from the time of Mongolian rule but from a much earlier period." In this

group such ancient correspondences as the Chuv. yěķě 'twins' ~ Mong. ikire (the modern ixir form is mentioned by him) are completely mixed with such loan-words of the Mongol epoch as the Mong. nōķūr → Chuv. neķer (here he quotes a nūķķěřě form as well). Unfortunately the majority of the enumerated correspondences are erroneous (e. g. Chuv. nar ~ Mong. nara 'Sun', Chuv. njuxa ~ Mong. noqai 'dog', Chuv. kakaj ~ Mong. ḡaqai 'swine', Chuv. tixa ~ Mong. dayan 'two-year old colt', etc.² and there are only two loans that are really from the Mongol epoch (Mong. nōķūr, siltax).

Sinor (1964, p.7) writes: "I am not speaking here of recent Mongol loan words in Chuvash. To my knowledge, these have never been studied or even mentioned, although their importance is obvious. The presence of Mongols in the Volga-region has left its traces and a methodical survey of these would help in shedding new light on a number of relevant problems." Unfortunately, Sinor did not deal with the question in greater detail.

Egorov's (1964) Chuvash etymological dictionary is a great step forward in the research of Chuvash lexicology. This is an excellent work, which, despite its methodological shortcomings will remain as an indispensable source for Altaistics. He quotes Mongolian parallels for several Chuvash words and occasionally expressly raises the Mongolian origin of a Chuvash word (e. g. Mong. bosoxa ~ Chuv.

pusaxa, Mong. elbeg ~ Chuv. ilpek, Mong. malapai ~ Chuv. mulaxxay, Mong. nöker ~ Chuv. neker, Mong. qarayul ~ Chuv. xural, etc.).

A new stage is represented by Räsänen (1969) in the history of the study of the problem. Räsänen does not separate the various chronological groups of Mongolian loan-words in the Turkic languages, yet in the great majority of cases he correctly points out the Mongolian origin of some Turkic, and Chuvash words among them, and in a few cases he indicates that the Mongolian word in question had reached the Chuvash language through Kipchak mediation.

The study of the Middle Mongolian loan-words of the Chuvash language offers several conclusions. 1. It offers an opportunity to isolate the earlier Chuvash-Mongolian correspondences from those of the Mongolian epoch. 2. It offers data having source value es regards the reconstruction of the Middle Mongolian dialects. 3. It lends basis to the clarification of the hitherto unsolved chronological questions of Volga Kipchak and Chuvash phonology by offering a terminus post quem to the estimation of those phonetic changes which took place even in the Mongolian loan-words. 4. Indirectly it offers help to the chronological definition of the Chuvash and Tatar loan-words in the Cheremis language. Keeping these points in view in the following I should like to study some words of Middle Mongolian

origin of the Chuvash language.

Before going into details, I should however briefly deal with the chronology of the Mongolian loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Volga-region. The way to the West and North-West was opened by the Mongols after their victory over the Russian-Cumanian army (1223) in the battle at the River Khalkha. From then onwards they were at permanent war with the Empire of the Volga Bulgarians. The record of Friar Julianus from 1235-1236 reports the following however: "The Tatar people are their neighbours but these Tatars, engaging in combat with them could not overcome them at war, moreover in the first battle the Tatars suffered defeat. But already in the aforementioned friar met Tatars in this land of the Eastern i.e. Volga Hungarians and also met with the envoy of the Tatar chief who spoke Hungarian, Russian, Cumanian, German, Saracenic and Tatar. He says that the Tatar army which is situated five days' distance from here prepares to march against Germany ..." (Gyórfy 1965, p. 43). But we know that on his second journey, in the summer of 1237, Julianus could only reach Susdal because the Mongols had occupied and completely destroyed the Empire of the Volga Bulgarians. According to Russian chronicles the fall of the Volga Bulgarian Empire took place in the autumn of 1236. (Istoriija 1966-1967).

Thus the earliest time limit of the Mongolian loan-words of the Volga Kipchak languages is the end of the thirties in the thirteenth century. Direct Mongolian linguistic influence may already have been insignificant by the end of the fourteenth century, but naturally we should take into account the continued spread of Mongolian words among the population of the Golden Horde for a long time. Mongolian words that were absorbed by the Volga Bulgarian, and subsequently by the Kipchak languages continued on their way in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries. Among the late Tatar loan-words of the Chuvash language there are also some of Middle Mongolian origin. In the meantime there is no criterion for deciding in several cases whether a word was borrowed by Chuvash with Volga Kipchak mediation or directly. Moreover, as in the Volga Bulgarian Empire there were at least two distinct dialects, one may even consider the possibility that the Middle Mongolian words of Modern Chuvash were transmitted through another Bulgarian Turkic dialect of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries.

The great structural identity of the Turkic and Mongolian languages further hampers the study of the Mongolian loan-words in Chuvash. In the following only those words will be discussed, for which we may infer an ultimate Middle Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word with a high degree of probability on the basis of phonetic, and histori-

cal criteria and of criteria of linguistic geography and cultural history. No doubt the number of words recognised as being of Middle Mongolian origin in the Chuvash language will increase with the advancement of research and even in the case of words without criteria we may reckon with some of them belonging to this group.

1. MMo abra- 'to save, to preserve'

Mongolian: MMo: E: abura- 'to help, to rescue' (SH), abura- 'id.' (Hy, HyB), abura- 'id.' (Ph); W: -. MoL: abura- 'to help, rescue; protect' (Lessing) ModMo: E: avra- 'to save, rescue' (KhL), abar- 'to save, protect, defend' (BurL), awura- 'to save'; (Ord.) W: awra- 'to save, preserve' (Kalm).

Chuvash: upra- 'to guard, protect' (Sirotkin 1961), upra- 'id' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: abra- 'to save, guard' (Tat DS).

The Mongolian word belongs to the family of ab- 'to take, get hold, etc.' from which it was formed by a deverbal -ra suffix (Cf. ebde- 'to break down, > ebdere-, bögle- 'to fill an opening' > böglere-, daba- 'to transgress' > dabara- etc.). The sound -u may have already disappeared in the lending Mongolian dialect, moreover, it is probable that we may reckon already with an abra- ~ abura- variant as is shown by the relevant derivatives: abu^χca 'receiving, adoption', abu^χul-fakt., abul^χca coop., aburi 'behaviour' etc.,

but abquɣul- caus., abčaldu- recipr.

The first occurrence of the word is in the Cumanian material of the Codex Cumanicus where Poppe (1962, p. 334) considers it to be of Mongolian origin. The word was also transmitted to Tuvanian as well as to Yakut (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p.2, Kažuyński 1961, p.41). It cannot be decided whether the word in the Chuvash language is of Volga Kipchak^o mediation or not, but it is certain that it was assimilated by Chuvash before the Chuvash a > o development. This word was considered to be of Mongolian origin already by Räsänen (1969, p.2).

2. MMo as(a)ra- 'to take care'

Mongolian: MMo: E: asara- 'to take care' (SH), asara- 'id.' (Hy), asara- 'id.' (Ph); W: asara- 'id.' (MA), asara- 'id.' (AL).

MoL: asara- 'to be compassionate, to take care, nourish, raise, support somebody by charity' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: asra- 'to extend hospitality, to take care of somebody' (KhL), asara- 'to protect, to take care, to rescue, to serve somebody' (Ord), asara- 'to take into protection, or care' (DahMu); W: asr-_o 'to protect, raise, to be kindly compassionate' (Kalm).

Chuvash: usra- 'to raise, to take care, to guard', usrav 'adopted (boy, girl)' (Sirotkin 1961), usra-_v 'to bring up' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: asra- 'to raise, nourish' (TatL),
asira- 'to maintain, to hold' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word which has spread in several Turkic languages (Cf. Räsänen 1969. p.29) and exists also in Manchu, is of Turkic origin. It is the adoption of the Turkic aša- 'to feed' to which had been associated a -ra deverbal verb forming suffix marking intensity (Cf. above). In one group of the Turkic loan-words in the Mongolian language the Turkic -š- corresponds to -s-: Tu. yemiš 'fruit' → Mong. Yimis, Tu. arviš 'magic formula' → Mong. arbis, Tu. bišlaš - 'cheese' → Mong. bisalaš - (but bišilaš as well). The Mongolian word had become the term for the acceptance of non-relatives into the family in the Mongol epoch, and had spread as such (see in detail Róna-Tas 1975). The word reached the Chuvash language by Tatar transmission which is indicated by the form usrav ← Tat. asrau as well. Already Räsänen (loc.cit.) considered this word to be of Mongolian origin.

3. MMo berke 'strong'

Mongolian: MMo: E: berke 'difficult, hard' (SH),
berke 'difficult' (Hy, HyA); W: berkā 'difficult, coarse' (IMM), bêrké 'difficult' (IMI), berket- 'to become strong' (MA).

MoL: berke 'difficult, clever, able to do something'

(Lessing).

ModMo: E: berch 'difficult, complicated, serious, experienced in something' (KhL), berche 'id.' (BurL), berkxe 'difficult' (Ord), berke 'difficult, very, strongly' (DahHP), pierce 'difficult' (Mgr), W: berkə 'difficult, wicked, rare' (Kalm).

Chuvash: parka 'healthy, solid, strong' (Sirotkin 1961), parka 'strong, thick' (Paasonen 1908), parka 'healthy, whole, enduring, big(eyed)' (Ašmarin IX, p.110).

Cheremis: parŋa 'quick (horse)' (Räsänen 1920, RMS).

The word is well-known in Old Turkic in the form berk. But in Chuvash the ancient final -rk sound group is solved by inserting a closed (> reduced) vowel: PT erk ~ Chuv. irĕk (< ⁺erik) 'freedom', PT ürk- ~ Chuv. ĕrĕx (< ⁺ürük-) 'to wake suddenly', PT bürk- ~ Chuv. pĕrĕx- (< ⁺bürük-) 'to spurt', PT turq ~ Chuv. tărăx (< ⁺turuq-) 'width, measure', PT qirq ~ Chuv. xĕrĕx (< ⁺qirig) 'forty'. The modern Chuvash form can be directly traced to a ⁺bärkä form. It is conspicuous that in Tatar and Bashkir a berket- 'to strengthen' verb is to be found where, instead of a closed -i- there is an -e- also indicating that the word is a loan, particularly corresponding to the Middle Mongolian MA item. The word was adopted into Chuvash before the Chuvash ä > a development.

The Cheremis word was taken over from Chuvash. Its meaning indicates that the word may have spread with horse breeding. Among the loan-words in the Turkic languages of the Mongolian epoch the proportion of terms relating to horse keeping is rather high. There are several such words among them that are of ultimate Turkic origin but had spread in the Turkic languages by Mongolian mediation. Presumably the Chuv. laša 'horse' and urxamax 'fiery, untame horse' also belong to this group.³ Both words are of Turkic origin but had spread in the Mongolian epoch through the Mongolians (see Mong. alaša, arɣamax).

4. MMo boljal, boljaɣ 'deadline, time agreed upon in advance'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bolja- 'to discuss (in advance), to agree upon, to state', boljal 'date agreed upon' (SH); W: boljal 'deadline' boljaldu- 'to agree upon something (in advance)' (MA).

MoL: bolja-, bolju- 'to agree upon (in advance), to know in advance' boljaɣa(n) 'agreement, rendezvous', boljol 'agreement, stipulation' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: boldzol 'agreement' (KhL), bolzor 'deadline', bolzoo 'agreement' (BurL), boldžō 'place, time agreed upon' (Ord), bolejō 'id.' (DahM) W: boldzōtā 'the person who has a rendezvous' (OirK), bolzār, bolzog 'deadline, agreement, stipulation' (Kalm).

Volga Kipchak: bulčal (Tat, Cf. Räsänen 1920, p. 184) → Voty. bolz'ou.

Chuvash: pălčav 'agreement on the day of the marriage' (Sirotkin 1961), pălčav 'gift bought or made by the bride for the bridegroom, etc.' (P), pălčav, pălčal, păncal 'final agreement on the day of the marriage' (Ašmarin X, pp. 110-111, 118).

Cheremis: punčal 'resolution' (Räsänen 1920, pp. 183-184, MRS).

The Mongolian words are substantives derived from the verb bolja-. From the point of the much debated question of the so-called Mongolian stem final vocals it may not be without importance to note that the word bolja- has a boljača form as well. The word is a loan in Chuvash because of the retained -č- (= -Dž-), which in ancient Chuvash words had become š (= ž) after -l-, e. g. PT qilič 'sword' ~ Chuv. xěš (< ⁺qilč), PT qilič 'weaver's reed' ~ Chuv. xěš (< ⁺qilč), PT ölč- 'to measure' ~ Chuv. vis-, PT belčen 'thistle' ~ Chuv. pišen, PT külčün 'loan' ~ Chuv. kivšen, küšen, PT yulič 'hair' ~ Chuv. šūs (< yluč and not sač!) etc. The Chuvash word was taken from the Volga Kipchak languages, which is also indicated by the terminal av ← au < ač development, or correspondence. The Mongolian word was adopted by Tatar before the o > u development of the Volga-region

where today it is regarded as a rare word, but the Votyak word was also taken from Tatar. The Chuvash adoption took place prior to the $\underline{u} > \underline{\ddot{o}}, \underline{\ddot{a}}$ development. The sound -n- is the result of the dissimilation under the effect of the final -l ($\underline{l-l} > \underline{n-l}$). The Mongolian word had spread almost among all the Turks and was adopted by the Tunguz, Georgian and Persian languages as well (see the data in Doerfer I, pp. 229-230, Räsänen 1969, p. 79). Doerfer (*loc. cit.*) interpreted the Turkic word to be of Mongolian origin, as did Räsänen (1969, p. 79), and the Mongolian parallel is also quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 147).

5. MMo bosaŋa 'threshold'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bosoqa 'threshold', boso- 'to block (the door)' (SH), bosoqa 'threshold' (Hy), bosqā- 'to erect (religious monument)' (Ph); W: bos- 'to stand up' (IMM, IMI), bos- 'id.' (AL), bosqa- 'to lift' (MA).

MoL: bosoŋa 'threshold, vertical, erect' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: bosgo 'threshold' (KhL), boŋog 'upper cross-bar of door' (Drg), bogoho, bohogo 'threshold' (BurL), boŋogo 'id.' (Ord), boŋoŋ (Ujūm), bosguo 'id.' (Mgr);

W: boks^o, bokāxa, bos^o, bosxa (Kalm).

Chuvash: pusaxa 'threshold; stirrup, hay rack, stair, stairstep' (Sirotkin 1961), pusaxa 'id.'. (Aŋmarin X, p. 8.)

Volga Kipchak: busaga 'threshold' (TatL).

The word is deduced by Poppe from an earlier Mong ⁺basu~~ɣ~~a < ⁺basurga form and he links the stem of the word to the Mong. basu- 'to hurt', Tu. bas- 'to press' family of words. (Poppe 1960a. p.65). This is apparently supported by DahHP basurga, DahMu basarxa and Tunguz (Vitimo-nerčinsk dial., Vasilevič 1958), basurga, Solon basarga 'threshold'. According to Doerfer (I, pp. 227-228) the Dahur word changed in Mongolian under the effect of the verb basu- because of taboo reasons and subsequently it got into Tunguz and Solon. Whatever the emergence of the Dahur word was (perhaps it is an early Yakut loan, though this word cannot be traced on the basis of Modern Yakut), it has no relationship to the Mong. boso~~ɣ~~a the stem of which is the Mongolian verb bos(o)- 'to stand up'. The Mong. boso~~ɣ~~a 'vertical, erect' adjective is derived from this stem, which is identical with the word in question. Regarding the suffix -~~ɣ~~a see Poppe (1927, p.94). In this context the Secret History of the Mongols is quite remarkable where the following can be read in section 245: Yirgo'an Qonggotan kö'üt inu e'üten boso~~ɣ~~u, "The six Kongkotan boys had blocked the door." In this sentence the verb boso- occurs in the sense 'to block, to close' and a few lines earlier there is the expression e'üten bosoqa 'the threshold of the door'. The cultic function of the threshold as

an addition to the door is really 'blocking the way' of evil. Up to the present time Mongols are not supposed to tread on the threshold and this was already mentioned by Rubruk in his account of the court of the Mongolian khans. (see Doerfer, I. p. 227).

The Chuvash word is directly adopted from Mongolian, which is also indicated by -x-. This sound is a voiced spirant (ɣ) in Modern Chuvash pronunciation, as all unvoiced consonants become voiced in Chuvash in an intervocalic position if they are not lengthened. Regarding the MB period it can only be stated that the sound was already a spirant by that time. The Chuvash word went through a semantic extension. The ancient Turkic bas- 'to press' had become pus- in Chuvash, i.e. the old bas- and bos- syllables coincided. Consequently the modern meanings of the word such as 'stair', 'stair-shaped object' developed. The Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word was correctly recognized by Doerfer (I, p.227), and also by Räsänen (1969, p.81). The Mongolian word was adopted by several Turkic languages, see the corresponding data in the quoted works of Doerfer and Räsänen.

6. MMo būral 'apple-grey (horse)'

Mongolian: MMo: E: - W: būrūl (read būrul) 'grey' (MA).

MoL: buḡural, buḡurul 'grey' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: būral 'grey, apple-grey' (KhL), būral 'id.' (BurL) bōral 'grey' (Jar), būral, būrul 'grey, reddish grey (horse colour)' (Ord), bōral 'greyish' (DahP); W: būrl_o 'white (haired), white furred' (Kalm).

Chuvash: pāvār, pāvārlă, purlă 'apple-grey' (Egorov 1964), pāvārlă, purlă 'id.' (Sirotkin 1961), purlă 'greyish, yellowish-greyish' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: burfi 'apple-grey' (TatL), buril 'id.' (BashkL).

Cheremis: purlo 'id.' (Räsänen 1923, p. 56, MRS).

The word spread in the Turkic languages was not collated by Räsänen (1969, p. 89) to the corresponding Mongolian one, and he reconstructed the PT shape in būr(li) form. In the majority of the Turkic languages the long Mongolian vowel was preserved: Taranchi būrul, Kazakh būrul, Soyot būrul, Altai pūlur, which would not have taken place in the case of original Turkic length. It is probable that, even in those lexical items where this is not indicated orthographically, the first syllable has a long vowel. The Chuv. āvă ~ u correspondence is a regular one with an adopted long ū.

The Mongolian word had spread as a horse colour. The Mongolian parallel of the Chuvash word is quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 146).

7. MMo bödene 'quail'

Mongolian: MMo: E: bödene 'quail' (Hy); W: bödene 'id.' (AL), bödene 'id.' (VI), bödene 'id.' (Qaz)

MoL: büdüne 'id.' (Kowalewski, Lessing), bödüne (Gol'-stunskij).

ModMo: E: bödnö 'id.' (KhL), büdne 'id.' (KhC, Lessing), büdene 'id.' (BurL), bödönö 'id.' (Ord) puduri, puduru 'id.' bodono 'tailless', bodono gū 'tailless bird' (Mgr);

W: bödn^ö, böd^önə 'quail' (Kalm), bodana 'id.' (MogMSL).

Chuvash: putene 'quail' (Sirotkin 1961), putene 'id.' (Paasonen 1908), pot'ene 'id.' (PR), putene, put'ana, pot'ana 'id.' (Ašmarin X, pp. 44-45, 54).

Cheremis: pot'ana 'id.' (Räsänen 1920, p. 182).

Volga Kipchak: büdänä 'id.' (TatL) büďänä (Bashk)

→ Voty. bod'ono.

The Buryat form of the Mongolian word penetrated into the Khalkha dialect as well, hence the ü reading of Khalkha and of the literary forms. The Monguor form is rather interesting, as it may have retained the original meaning of the word. The Chuvash word may be of direct Volga Kipchak origin prior to the time when the Chuvash secondary ü evolved, but it could be an adoption directly from Mongolian. It is remarkable that the forms of the Chuvash dialects show a change to the back vocalic set which is frequent in the case of ancient Chuvash

words (Cf. ⁺ökür > vākār 'ox' ⁺ör > var 'middle' etc.). The Chuvash word got into Cheremis and the Volga Kipchak word to Votyak. The word is known in several Turkic languages and they had conveyed it to Persian and Vogul. The Mongolian origin of the Turkic word was already recognized by Räsänen (1920, p.182), and Ligeti (1962a, p.21) held a similar view, together with Egorov (1964, p.167) and Doerfer (I, p.218) and most recently Räsänen (1969, p.82), see the Turkic, Persian, Afghan and Vogul data in the same works.

8. MMo būldürge 'loop made of leather on a whip handle'

Mongolian: MMo: --

MoL: bögeldürge, bögöldürge 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: bögöldörgö 'id.' (KhL) bügelderge 'a strap of a saddle, loop on a whip handle' (Ord); W: --.

Chuvash: pältärka 'strap on the handle of lash' (Sirotkin 1961), pältärka 'strap or string, or loop for the hand at the tip of whip handle' (Paasonen 1908).

Cheremis: melderğa, pelDerGa 'id.' (Räsänen 1920, p.40, 1923, p.46, 1908).

Volga Kipchak: böldörkă, möldörkă 'id.' (TatDS), möldörmă (TatPaasonen 1908).

The Mongolian word belongs to the family of bökö- ~ bögö- < bükü- ~ büg- 'to bend' (see Tu. bük- 'id.').

The word būgūrge 'saddle bow, pommel' (see KhL būreg, būrgen, Kalm būr^üg, būrgə) also belongs to this family of words. I have not found this word in the Middle and Modern Mongolian sources of the western Mongolians. But as a Mongolian loan it can be found in the Muqaddimat al-Adab (as būldūrge), in Kazakh (būldūrgö), and in Kirghiz (būldūrgö, būldūrgü), where the Middle Mongolian long vowel is represented by a short sound just as well as in Volga Kipchak and Chuvash. The Chuvash word may have been taken over directly or by Tatar transmission, the Cheremis word may be of Chuvash or Tatar transmission. On its Mongolian origin see Räsänen (1969, p. 92).

9. MMo čabidur 'light brown, with white mane and tail'

Mongolian: MMo: E: --; W: čabdar 'light brown (horse colour) (MA).

MoL: čabidar 'reddish-yellow, with white mane and tail' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: cav'dar 'light brown (horse colour)' (KhL), savidar 'id.' (BurL), tšawidar 'red with white mane and tail' (Ord), tšāwdar 'id.' (Üjüm); W: tsābdr_o 'dark or of brown colour but with white mane and tail' (Kalm).

Chuvash: čuptar 'cream, light brown (horse colour)' (Sirotkin 1961), čuptar 'it is said of the colour of the horse, ? cream' (Paasonen 1908).

Volga Kipchak: čaptar 'light brown' (TatL), saptar 'id.' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word derives from the čā- 'to be white' stem. The Chuvash word is a loan from Tatar prior to the Chuvash ä > o transition but after the č > ś change. The word was already explained by Joki (1952, p.278) as a Mongolian loan-word in the Turkic languages and in Kamassian, which was accepted by Räsänen (1969, p.94), the Mongolian parallel is given also by Egorov (1954). See the Turkic data in these works.

10. MMo čida- 'to be able'

Mongolian: MMo: E: čida- 'to be able, to be capable of defeating' (SH), čida- (Hy, HyAB), čida- 'id.' (Ph); W: čida- 'to do correctly' (IMI), čida- 'to be able, to know' (MA).

MoL: čida- 'to be able' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: čad- 'to be able, to know' (KhL), šada- 'id.' (BurL), tšida- 'id.' (Ord), šad- 'id.' (Jar), šad-, šada- 'id.' (DahHP), šad- 'id.' (DahIv), šade- 'id.' (DahM), sda- 'id.' (Mgr); W: tšad^a- 'id.' (Kalm), čidān 'power, strength' (MogZ,K), čidā- 'to be able' (MogMrL).

Chuvash: čāt- 'to tolerate, to endure, to expiate, to hold out, to return (expenses)' (Sirotkin 1961), čāt- 'to tolerate, to endure, to bear' (Paasonen 1908).

Cheremis: čit- 'to bear, to endure, to suffer' (MRS, Räsänen 1920, p.90, 1923, p.78).

Volga Kipchak: čida- 'to tolerate, to endure, to suffer' (TatL), čâda- 'to endure' (TatP); sida- 'to tolerate, to endure, to suffer' (BashkL).

It requires further study to see if the Mongolian word is related to the Turkic verb tid- 'to hold up', as it is considered by Poppe (1960a, p.15) and Räsänen (1969, p.477). The meaning of the Mongolian word is 'to be capable of doing something, to hold something in somebody's power' and the 'to endure, to tolerate' meanings of the Mongolian form adopted by several Turkic dialects are closely interrelated (Cf. Hung. bírni, kibírni). The Chuvash and Cheremis words are late loans from Tatar. The Mongolian origin of the Turkic words was pointed out also by Ligeti (1964, p.36) besides Poppe and Räsänen (loc.cit.), and see the other Turkic data at the same place.

11. MMo delbege 'bridle, reins'

Mongolian: MMo: E: delbege 'id.' (SH); W: --.

MoL: delbeg 'rein(s)' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: delbeg 'id.' (KhL); W: --.

Chuvash: tilxepe 'bridle, reins' (Sirotkin 1961)

tilxepe, tilkepe 'reins' (Paasonen 1908), tilkepe, tilxepe, kilkepe (Ašmarin VI, p.22) 'id.'.

Volga Kipchak: dilbegä 'reins' (TatL), tilbüge, tilbägä, tilbigä, dilbägä, dilbegä, zilbigä (Räsänen 1969,

p. 471), dilbegā 'id.' (BashkL).

The Mongolian word may belong to a family of words meaning 'flat, broad', Cf. delbeg 'wide, large', delbeyi- 'to be wide, to become wide', delbeng, delbing 'protruding (something flat, eg. an ear)'. In Turkic languages there is a word tāl meaning 'thread, wire' which at least may have been mixed with the Mongolian forms adopted by Turkic (see Kumyk telbavlar 'bridle' (RKmk), (Grønbech 1942), telbuṛa 'ground-rope' (Räsänen 1969, p. 471). The Mongolian origin of the Volga Kipchak words is clearly indicated by the Tatar and Bashkir forms with d- initial. The Turkic word was considered to be of Mongolian origin by Doerfer and Poppe (Cf. their proof notes to Räsänen 1969, p. 471), but Poppe does not discuss the tel-buṛa item among the Mongolian loans in his article on the Mongolian elements of the Codex Cumanicus. Egorov (1954, p. 251), who refers to the Mongolian word among others, derives the Chuvash word from til 'tongue', and baṛ 'rope' which cannot be accepted either because of semantic or phonetic considerations (see bosaṛa). The word came from Siberian Tatar to the Ob Ugrian languages (Osty. tetpou, Vog. tilpen, see Räsänen 1969, p. 471). The Mongolian word was borrowed by these languages prior to the Volga Turkic e > i development.

12. MMo dem 'help, assistance'

Mongolian: MMo: E: dem 'auxiliary-, rear troop' (SA);

W: --.

ModMo: E: dem 'way of action, capacity, skill' (KhL). dem 'id.' (BurL), dem 'help, skill obtained by practice' (Ord),

W: dem 'help, assistance' (Kalm).

Chuvash: tim 'wish, ambition, effort, inclination, initiative, activity, firmness, perseverance, resoluteness, courage, daring, self-consciousness' (Sirotkin 1961), tim 'ambition, effort, decision' timle- 'to look after, to make an effort, to convince' (Ašmarin XIV, p. 40).

Volga Kipchak: dim 'persuasion, warning, advice, conviction' (TatL), dim 'id.' (BashkL).

The initial d- of the Volga Kipchak word clearly indicates its Mongolian origin and this is further supported by the fact that the word is lacking in Turkic antiquity. Of the Modern Turkic languages it can be found only in Altaic, Koibal, Soyot and Kazakh. The Chuvash word is presumably of Tatar mediation which is mainly indicated by its semantic development; anyhow, the adoption had taken place prior to the e > i development. The word was considered to be of Mongolian origin by Räsänen (1969, p. 135), see the Turkic data there.

13. MMo elbeg 'abundance, remains'

Mongolian: MMo: -

MoL: elbeg 'abundance, abundant' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: elbeg 'abundance, abundant' (KhL), elbeg 'id.' (BurL), elbek 'id.' (Ord), elweg 'rich, abundant' (Ujüm), W: elwäg 'abundant, surplus' (Kalm).
 Chuvash: ilpek 'abundance, surplus' (Sirotkin 1961), ilpek 'abundance' (Ašmarin III, p. 111).

The first occurrence of the Mongolian word in Turkic is in the Codex Cumanicus where Poppe (1962, p. 335) considers it to be a Mongolian word. It was borrowed from Mongolian by the Altaic, Tuvanian and Yakut languages. Further investigation is needed to see how the Mongolian word is related to the Tara and Kürdek Turkic ālāk 'many' and to the Kalmuck elēde 'richly, in great abundance, much' quoted by Räsänen (1969, p. 39). It cannot be excluded that the -b- of elbeg is similar to the -b- of qalbağa or qarbing where -b- is missing from the corresponding Turkic forms. The Turkic words were originated from Mongolian according to Räsänen (*loc. cit.*) and the Chuvash one according to Egorov (1964, p. 69).

14. MMo foiqan 'beautiful'

Mongolian: MMo: -

MoL: foyuqan 'graceful, beautiful', foyida 'excellent, the best', foyi, foyu 'beautiful, smart, elegant' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: goyochon 'very beautiful, fairly beautiful', goyo 'beautiful', qoyd 'very' (KhL), goyochon 'pretty', qoyo 'beautiful' (BurL), goi 'id.' (DahHP); W: gög? 'woman of easy

virtue' (Kalm).

Chuvash: xŭxēm 'beautiful, smart, of good quality' (Sirotkin 1961) xŭxēm, xŭxxēm 'beautiful, smart, good, excellent, tall, strong' (Ašmarin XVI, p.287).

The Chuvash word was related to the Mongolian ɣayiqɑ 'to be surprised' according to Ramstedt (1957, p.48, 1952, p.107) and classified among the ancient Altaic correspondences. But this etymology has phonetic problems. An ancient ai diphthong has two equivalents in Chuvash: äi, or ui : PT qayir 'sand' ~ Chuv. xäyär, PT qaymaq 'cream' ~ Chuv. xäyma, PT sayla- 'to select' ~ Chuv. suyla-, PT bay- 'to become rich' ~ Chuv. puy-. This double equivalence is parallel to the double Chuvash equivalence (i, u) of the PT a. Thus the Chuvash -ü- cannot originate from an ancient ai diphthong.

Egorov (1964) in his etymological dictionary gave the Tu. körkem 'beautiful' as the equivalent of the Chuvash word. This is again unacceptable for phonetical reasons. The original palatal k- does not become ɣ- in Chuvash. The Tu. körkem is a derivative of the verb kör- 'to see' and this word in Modern Chuvash is kur-.

At first sight the Chuvash word offers a contradictory phonetic character. Its initial and medial ɣ can only go back to a back k whereas its vocals at present form a front set. But this contradiction is only apparent. The original oi > ui

diphthong in Chuvash has become u: PT soy- 'to skin' ~ Chuv. sū- (< sui soi), PT quyma 'fence', ~ Chuv. xūme, PT quytu 'defence wall' ~ Chuv. xūtě, PT buyur- 'to order' ~ Chuv. pūr- (< buir-), etc. This development is fairly recent in Chuvash, as such words were involved as, Chuv. pū 'body' (< bui < boi ← boy < bod), thus these are loan-words of an age when the d > ǫ > y change had already taken place in the lending language.

The final -m is a regular Chuvash development: PT altun 'gold' ~ Chuv. iltām, PT qirqin 'slave girl' ~ Chuv. xārxām (-m already exists in this word in the VB inscriptions), PT barčun 'velvet' ~ Chuv. pursām etc. This -m appears at an early stage as it can be observed in some of the Turkic loan-words in the Hungarian language prior to the age of the Conquest (see e. g. szám ← sām < sān), but there it is not without exceptions (see e. g. bársony). On the other hand the development had taken place in recent Tatar loan-words as well, e. g. yaxām 'near' ← Tat. yakīn. How can this apparent contradiction be explained? In Chuvash dialects one can observe an n ~ m change even today: yaxān ~ yaxām, iltān ~ iltām, xārxān ~ xārxām, pursān ~ pursām. Thus the final -m does not necessarily refer to an ancient word. As has been demonstrated, the Chuvash χ can equally well correspond to a transmitting g or a ǧ. One need not unconditionally imagine a

spirant meditating form as in Chuvash, after the $q > x$ development temporarily there were no ka, ko, ku, ki syllables, consequently in such cases a substitution of sounds took place. Thus the Mong. ᠬᠣᠶᠢᠭᠠᠨ, or ᠬᠣᠶᠢᠭᠤᠨ form had to become xoixän in Chuvash from which the form xüxëm regularly evolved through a xuixän form.

The word should be regarded as a Mongolian loan-word because it has a clear etymology in Mongolian (ᠬᠣᠶᠢ 'beautiful' + -ᠭᠠᠨ diminutive suffix), whereas this word has no etymology in Chuvash. The Chuvash x- may be derived from a Mongolian q whereas the reverse cannot be done, the word is unknown in the other Turkic dialects. Further investigation is needed to see how the Mongolian ᠬᠣᠶᠢ, ᠬᠣᠶᠤ 'beautiful' is related to the Turkic word qoyi, qoyu 'fat'. This may be traced back to a primary *qo- stem.

For the time of the adoption the period prior to the $o > u$, $ui > ü$ development should be considered. But it is known, that the $ui > ü$ development took place in Chuvash after the ST $d > \check{d} > y$ development, i.e., at any rate after the tenth-eleventh centuries (see qudrug $>$ quyruq \rightarrow xürë). Thus the adoption has no chronological obstacle. The Mongolian word has not been traced so far in the Volga Kipchak languages, and for this and additional phonetic reasons it is indicated that most probably we have to deal

with a direct borrowing.

15. MMo horam 'trace, road'

Mongolian: MMo: E: horum 'trace (of stag), (forest) trail; lane' (SH); W: --.

MoL: orum 'trace, footprint, stream, foundation, origin' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: orom 'trace, footprint' (KhL), orom 'id.' (BurL), orom 'trace, surface, plan', džamīn orom bān 'the way has a trace' (Ord); W: orm 'mark of something, trace, distinguishing mark, place, office' (Kalm), oram 'place' (MogR).

Chuvash: uram 'way, line' (Sirotkin 1961), ǎram, uram (Paasonen 1908), uram (Sp) 'street', oram 'id.' (PR), uram, oram 'street, merchants' row in the bazaar' (Ašmarin III, p.268-9), ǎram 'id.' (Ašmarin IV, p.55).

Volga Kipchak: uram 'street' (TatL, BashkL).

Cheremis: urem, orem 'street' (Räsänen 1923, RMS).

The word is unknown in Old Turkic. Our earliest Turkic data are from the thirteenth century (Yugnaki, Tefsir), thus from a time subsequent to the appearance of the Mongolians. The word of corresponding meaning is oruq in Turkic, and this Turkic word and the Mongolian one are related in all probabilities, but their common basic word is not clear? hor- 'to turn (to the other side)'. The Mong. oro- 'to enter' cannot be related to our word as it has no h- initial in Middle Mongolian. In the Mon-

golian word there is a deverbal -m (Cf. Poppe 1927, p. 102), which is known in the Turkic languages, consequently in Chuvash as well (Cf. e.g. vilēm < ölüm 'death' < öl- 'to die'). The Mongolian word has spread to some other Turkic languages as well (Cf. Räsänen 1920, p. 82, 1969, p. 364). Ramstedt (1935, 1949) includes under this heading the Korean poram 'distinguishing mark'. The spread of the word in the Mongolian epoch may be related to the Mongolian administration. The Chuvash word could be of Volga Kipchak mediation, but it is more probable that it was directly adopted.

16. MMo Ya'uči 'matchmaker, go-between,
suitor'

Mongolian: MMo: E: Ya'ura 'between' (SH, Hy, HyAB, Ph), W: ŷura 'in between' (MA).

MoL: ŷaŷuči 'mediator, go-between' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: dzūč 'suitor, matchmaker' (KhL), zūrša 'go-between, suitor' (BurL), džutši 'matchmaker' (Ord), džioro 'between' (Mgr) džogon (= džōgon) 'between' (Pao); W: zūtši, zūltši 'mediator, spy' (Kalm), ŷaurā 'from among' (MogZ), ŷurō (MogR), ŷaurā (MogMrL); ŷaura (MogML), 'half, middle'.

Cheremis: sauš, savuš (MRS), s'äus, sauš, s'aŷas, s'aŷus, sagus, savus (Räsänen 1923, p. 190) 'wedding groomsmen, witness to marriage, bridesman' ← Chuv.

⁺šausi.

Chuvash: yevčě 'suitor' (Sirotkin 1961), yevče (read yevčě) 'proxy, groomsman' (Paasonen 1908), yevčě 'suitor, procurer, go-between' (Ašmarin IV, p.264).

Volga Kipchak: yāuči 'suitor' (TatL) Yauci 'id.' (TatO), yausi 'id.' (BashkL), sautsi 'id.' (Siberian Tatar).

The word was adopted by Chuvash in two variants. The first form has been preserved only by Cheremis, the other one is a late Tatar loan. The word was derived by Paasonen (1902, p.242) from the Tu. čauš 'commander, guard', by Räsänen (1920, p.190) from the Tu. yauči 'matchmaker', subsequently from a Mong. Yabuči (1949, p.125) and most recently (1969, p.176) from a Mong. yabulči form. The word čauš and the Mong. yabulči cannot belong to this heading because of phonetic reasons, and the Tu. yauči is a Mongolian loan-word, in fact identical with our item. The Mongolian word consists of the ⁺Yaju 'in between' stem (Cf. Yajura 'middle place, in between', Yajurmay 'mid-way, at a place betwixt and between' Yabsar 'inter', Yayi 'middle place, distance') (regarding the stem see Kotwicz 1953, pp. 334-335) - and of the nomen actoris suffix -či. I have not met the word in Middle Mongolian sources, only in Literary Mongolian and in the modern dialects, but as a Middle Mon-

golian loan-word it exists in Chagatay (yauχī), in Karakalpak, with the Altai Turks and the Kirghiz. Cheremis had adopted the word after the Chuvash ŷ > ś development, but prior to the ś > s development that had taken place in the majority of the Cheremis dialects (Cf. Cher. surt 'house' ← Chuv. śurt < ŷurt, Cher. sorta 'candle' ← Chuv. śorta < ŷarta etc.). The Cheremis and the Volga Kipchak words have retained the MMo diphthong. The late Chuv. yeuχē is from a time following the Tatar ya > yā development.

17. MMo malaxai 'cap'

Mongolian: MMo: E: maqalai 'cap' (SH), maḡala (Chy); W: maḡala (IMM, IMI), maqalai 'id.' (MA).

MoL: malaxa, malaxai 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: malgay 'id.' (KhL), malgay (BurL), malaga (Ord), malax (Üjüm), magal (DahHP), magala, maxala (DahIv), max'la, mahal (DahMu), malexe (DahM), marga (Mgr), magala (Tung), malge (Pao); W: malxā (OirK), maxlā, malxā (Kalm), malḡai (MogZ,K), malḡei (MogR), malghai (MogL), malḡai (MogMrL), malḡei (MogML, MogMSL), all with identical meaning.

Chuvash: mulaxxay 'cap, a malahay' (Sirotkin 1961), malaxay 'pointed winter cap' (Paasonen 1908), molaxay (PR), mulaxay, mulaxxay (Ašmarin VIII, p.260), malaxay, malaxxay (loc. cit. p.183).

Volga Kipchak: malaxai 'pointed fur cap' (TatR IV, 2037).

Cheremis: malaxai 'fur cap' (Räsänen 1920, p. 135, 1923, p. 45).

The word passed into Russian from Mongolian (Cf. Fasmer, II, p. 562, Räsänen 1969, p. 324) and the malaxai items in the Volga languages are partly re-borrowed from Russian. The Mongolian word passed into Teleut (Räsänen 1969, p. 324) and Manchu (maxala). Data of Mongolian linguistic history indicate that of the maṣala(i) ~ malaṣa(i) variants the first is the older one and the second is the result of metathesis, but until the etymology of the word is definitely identified, the problem cannot be finally solved.

The Chuv. mulaxxay may be a regular adoption of a MMo malaṣai form. The survival of the final -ai (Cf. Note 2) is an important criterion of its being a loan. Egorov (1964, p. 135) refers to the Mongolian parallel, and Räsänen (loc. cit.) also considers the word to be of Mongolian origin.

18. MMo mergen 'a good marksman, wise'
Mongolian: MMo: E: mergen 'honest, clever (woman)' (SH), mergen 'clever (in everything)' (Hy), mergen 'wise, learned' (Ph); W: --.
MoL: mergen 'a good marksman, wise, experienced' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: mergen 'excellent archer, clever, wise, punctual', mergen buudagč 'exact marksman' (KhL), merge(n) 'excellent archer, clever, wise, punctual' (BurL), mergen 'clever, cunning' (Ord), mergē 'wise' (Üjüm), mergen 'id.' (Jar), mergen 'wise, hunter' (DahM), miergān 'clever, able, wise' (Mgr), mergen 'exact, wise' (Tung);
W: mergn 'artist, clever, one who understands his craft, hunter' (Kalm).

Cheremis: margan 'punctual' (Räsänen 1969, p. 335, MRS).

Volga Kipchak: mārgān 'exact archer', 'a master shot, exact, exactly' (BashkL).

The word was adopted by several Turkic languages as well (Cf. Doerfer I, p. 498, Räsänen 1969, p. 335) and subsequently it has also spread among the Ob-Ugrian and the southern Samoyed languages (Cf. Joki 1952, p. 228). It reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation as was correctly stated by Räsänen (*loc. cit.*) and Doerfer (*loc. cit.*), but the word is unknown in Modern Chuvash. On the other hand, it is known in several Manchu-Tunguz languages. Mongolian loan-words are the Manchu mergen (Cf. Ligeti 1960, p. 243, Doerfer, *loc. cit.*), the Evenki mergen 'sorrow' and the Even mergen 'reason', the Ude meysge 'id.' and the Nanay mergen 'successful, good son'. In Mongolian only the verbal form of the word, derived from the mergen substantive, occurs, but the Manchu merki- 'to

be conscious', the Evenki merge- 'to despair, to be sad, to ponder, to meditate', the Even merge- 'to think' and the Negidal meygen- 'to be sad, to feel sorry for something', the Ude meisi- 'to think', the Oroch miyči- 'id.' refer to the existence of a verb ⁺merge-. As one would expect, there is a Y- in Manchu in the original place of -rg-, the family of words at least in part should be regarded as loans. The Even and Evenki -rg-, the Nederal -yg- may be ancient as well as loans, but in the place of the Oroch -yč-, the Ude -ys- one would expect -gg/kk-, or k/g ~ yg forms in the case of an ancient Manchu-Tunguz -rg- (Cf. Cincius 1949, pp.230-231, 236-237, Benzing 1955, pp.995-996, Ligeti 1960, p.241), therefore even the Manchu-Tunguz verbal forms should be regarded as loans keeping open the alternative that not every Manchu-Tunguz dialect had borrowed the word directly from Mongolian, but the image is confused by loans within the Manchu-Tunguz group itself. Thus the basic meaning of the Mongolian verb is approximately 'to be in trouble' (as to the context of the meanings of 'sorrow', 'to be sad' and 'to think' Cf. the connection between the Hungarian gond 'trouble' and gondolkodni 'to think'), of this the meaning 'to be conscious, resolute' and subsequently 'to do something well, exactly, consciously (e.g. to shoot to target)'. The semantic development is explained by Doerfer (loc.cit.) in a different manner.

Thus the Indo-Iranian etymology suggested by Fasmer (Cf. Sanskrit mrgayus 'hunter', III, p. 660) should be regarded improbable primarily because of reasons of semantic history. The Mongolian word passed into Cheremis after the Chuvash ā > a development.

19. MMo moqa 'blunt'

Mongolian: MMo: E: moqodaq 'blunt' (Hy); W: moqadaq 'id.' (MA).

MoL: moqoya 'blunt', moqo- 'to be blunt' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: mochdog, mochoo 'blunt' (KhL), moxor 'curved, blunt tipped' (Drg), mochoo 'blunt' (BurL), muxudak, muxuduk, muxugur, muxun, muxur 'id.' (Ord), møxøŕ 'blunt, lower or external part' (Üjüm), mogordur, mogodur 'blunt', mugur 'dead-end' (Mgr), mugutu 'blunt' (Tung); W: mokā, moxā, moxā 'blunt' (Kalm).

Chuvash: māka 'blunt' (Sirotkin 1961), maka (Paasonen 1908), muka (Sp, UčP) 'id.', mōka (Ašmarin VIII, p. 294), muka, moka (loc. cit. p. 257) 'id.'.

Volga Kipchak: mokit 'stupid, dull' (TatL), mokiy 'id.' (TatDS), moqot 'dull-witted, dull of comprehension' (BashkL).

The word in Chuvash is a loan from Kipchak because of the retained -k-, where the basic word cannot be traced. The Mongolian word was adopted by several other Turkic languages (Cf. Doerfer I, pp. 509-10, Räsänen 1969,

p. 340), and also by Votyak and southern Samoyed (Joki 1952, pp. 103, 232). The word moxdaq 'blunt' occurring in the Codex Cumanicus also belongs to this family which was regarded to be of Mongolian origin even by Grønbech, but the word was not discussed by Poppe (1962) among the Mongolian elements of the Cumanian language. This is our oldest Turkic item. The word was considered to be of Mongolian origin already by Doerfer (loc. cit.) and by Räsänen (loc. cit.) without Chuvash. The Mongolian parallel was already referred to by Egorov (1964, p. 131).

20. MMo narad (plural) 'forest pine'

Mongolian: MMo: E: narat (plural) 'spruce' (SH), narasun 'pine' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: narasun, plural narad 'conifers' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: nars 'id.' (KhL), narha(n) 'id.' (BurL), narasu 'id.' (Ord), nars (DahHP) 'id.' naresse 'cypress, cedar' (DahM); W: narasn 'pine' (OirK).

Chuvash: narat 'pine' (Sirotkin 1961, dial.), narat 'Pinus silvestris (only in riddles)', narat, nart 'id.' (Asmarin IX, pp. 9, 11).

Volga Kipchak: narat 'pine' (TatL), narat yiläge 'cowberry' (BashkP).

The word in Chuvash is a Tatar, whereas in Tatar it is a Mongolian loan, as has already been rightly stated by Räsänen (1969, p. 350). The reason is that n- in initial

position does not occur in original Turkic words. It is remarkable that the word is known only in Karachai-Balkhar of the Turkic languages (narat). The Turkic relatives of the Hungarian kóris have a similar prevalence, as the word occurs only in Chuvash (kavřés') and in Karachai (kūrūč), further on in the western Mongolian languages (Cf. Kalm. kūr^us). The affinity to this group of the Tat. koric agač and the Bashk. koros agas quoted by Egorov (1964, p. 84) is doubtful, but the Ossetian kaerz, kaerzæ is related to the word kóris. Yet it is not sure that the history of the two words was identical. The word narat has so far been found only in sources of the eastern Mongolian dialects and it cannot be excluded that the Oirat word collected by Kara (1959) is also a Khalkha loan. Yet the word may have existed in old western Mongolian dialects as can be inferred from its presence in the Volga Languages.

21. MMo niγ 'solid'

Mongolian: MMo: E: niyitaitala 'tightly' (SH < ⁺ niγi-);

W: --.

MoL: niγ 'solid, dense, condensed' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: njag 'dense, solid' (KhL), nigta 'id.' (BurL),

nigta 'id.' (Ord); W: nig 'dense, hard, strong (eg. scarf)' (Kalm).

Chuvash: nākā 'hard, strong' (Sirotkin 1961), nākā

'firmly, steadily' (Paasonen 1908), nāk 'densely filled (e.g. flour in the sack, etc.)' nāk, nākā 'strong, solid' (Ašmarin IX, p. 52).

Volga Kipchak: nīk 'strong, solid, hard' (TatL), niq 'id.' (BashkL)

Cheremis: nək 'strong' (Räsänen 1923, p. 47).

The word exists in some other Kipchak and Siberian languages as well (Cf. Egorov 1964, p. 138), where, as has been correctly pointed out by Räsänen (1969, p. 353), it is a Mongolian loan-word. In Chuvash it is a Tatar loan because of the medial -k-. The final -ā is a secondary Chuvash phenomenon. It occurs in several other late Tatar loans: Tat. yāš → Chuv. yašē 'young', Tat. čik → Chuv. čikē 'border', Tat. kül → Chuv. külē 'lake' etc. The reason of this phenomenon is, that in Chuvash the original final reduced vowels are always in an unstressed position, thus their disappearance has begun. Under the impact of the alternative occurrence of the forms with a reduced or zero ending, the word finals were reduced even in cases where the process is etymologically unjustified. The Khalkha njag goes back to an original ⁺nija form, its corresponding item should have been nāka in Chuvash (in the case of an East Mongolian word mediated by Tatar), or nāxa (if the borrowing were direct).

22. MMo noxta 'halter'

Mongolian: MMo: E: --, W: noqta 'halter' (AL), noxta 'id.' (MA).

MoL: noyto 'id.' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: nogt 'id.' (KhL), noxt 'part of the halter' (Drg), nogto 'halter' (BurL), nogto 'id.' (Ord), noxt 'id.' (Üjüm), nogdō 'id.' (Mgr); W: nokt^o 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: nǎxta 'id.' (Sirotkin 1961), nǎxta (Paasonen 1908), nǒxta (Sp) 'bit (made of rope)', nǎxta (Ašmarin IX, p. 57), nǎkta (loc. cit. p. 53), nǎktov (loc. cit. p. 53) 'halter'.
Volga Kipchak: nukta 'id.' (TatL, BashkL), nokta 'id.' (TatP).

Cheremis: nukta 'id.' (Räsänen 1923, p. 48, MRS).

The Mongolian word was in extensive use in the Mongolian epoch, existing in several Turkic languages (Egorov 1964, p. 138, Doerfer I, pp. 517-18, Räsänen 1969, p. 354), and it appeared for the first time in the Codex Cumanicus (Cf. Poppe 1962, p. 336). The word was rightly considered to be of Mongolian origin by Poppe, Egorov, Doerfer and Räsänen. Chuvash had adopted the forms with -x- presumably from Mongolian at an early date, whereas the forms with -k- came from Tatar. The Cheremis word also originates from Tatar (Cf. Räsänen 1923, p. 48).

23. MMo nöker 'companion'

Mongolian: MMo: E: nökör 'companion' (SH), nökör

'id.' (Hy), nökör 'id.' (Ph); W: nöker 'friend' (IMM), nökör 'id.' (IMI), nöker 'id.' (MA), nöker 'companion' (VI).

MoL: nökör 'friend, companion, husband' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: nöchör 'comrade, companion, friend, husband' (KhL), nücher 'id.' (BurL), nöcxör 'id.' (Ord), nóxör 'id.' (Üjüm), nügür 'husband' (DaHP), nokuor 'id.' (Mgr), noke 'companion' (Tung), noker 'id.' (Pao), W: nökör 'companion, spouse' (Oirk), nökr 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: kérneker, kěrnüker 'bridesman of the bridegroom' (Sirotkin 1961) neker (Ašmarin IX, p.18), nüker (loc. cit. p.46) 'id.'.

Cheremis: nuŋar, nügar in: yes n. 'child, family, servant' (Räsänen 1923, p.47).

The word was extensively dealt with by Vladimircov (1934, passim), Németh (1953), Ligeti (1935, p.242, 1962, pp.58-59), Doerfer (I, pp.521-526) and Räsänen (1969, pp.354-5), where the spread of the word in the Turkic languages and elsewhere can be found, together with the related literature. The Chuvash correspondence has hitherto escaped the attention of the researchers. The first part of the word kérneker is identical with the word kěrü 'son-in-law, bridegroom' (< ⁺küdeg), the expression indicates the 'companions' of the bridegroom. The Mongolian word itself may be the direct antecedent of the Chuvash

word, in this case the lack of the expected $\bar{o} > \bar{ö}, \bar{ě}$ development may be attributed to the condition that the nö-syllable did not fall in initial position. The word has not occurred so far in the Volga Kipchak languages but the Cheremis word is presumably of Tatar origin.

24. MMo qaiči 'scissors'

Mongolian: MMo: E: qayiči 'scissors' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: qayiči(n) 'scissors, pincers' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: chayč(in) (KhL), xaetš (Drg), chayša (BurL), xātši (Ord), xetš (Üjüm), xēš (Jar), xaič, xaiči (DahHP), kaiči (DahM), xēdzi (Mgr), kaiči (Tung); W: xātšⁱ (Kalm), qetiči (MogR), the meaning being identical everywhere with that of Literary Mongolian.

Chuvash: xačč (Sirotkin 1961), xayčč (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xayčä (Ašmarin XVI, p. 16), xač, xačä (loc. cit., p. 74).

Volga Kipchak: kaiči (TatL), qaiče, kajče, kačë, kašë (TatP), qaysi (BashkL).

Cheremis: kači, kače (Räsänen 1923, p. 5, MRS).

Poppe (1927a, p. 165) had already pointed out the Mongolian origin by Tatar mediation of the Chuvash word, and the word is discussed also by Doerfer (I, pp. 448-50) and Räsänen (1969, p. 221, 1920, p. 67, 1923, p. 35). Egorov (1964, p. 284) who quotes the Mongolian word as well, wrongly considers the Chuvash word to be of Per-

sian origin. The word spread into several other languages besides the Turkic ones (see the data in Doerfer and Räsänen loc.cit.). It is the derivative of the Mongolian verb qayi- 'to cut', which originally meant 'to pinch, to catch'. This Mongolian verb is related to the Turkic verb qap- 'to catch', and its derivative, that is parallel to the Mongolian one is qapiti (Cf. Grønbech 1942), qipti, Khak. xipti-, Yak. kipti. (I have not found the form xapti, quoted by Poppe and adopted by Räsänen). Because of the retained -č- the Chuvash word is a relatively late loan presumably from Tatar.

25. MMo qara'ul 'watch'

Mongolian: MMo: E: qara'ul 'reconnaissance (party), scouting (patrol)' (SH); W: qara'ul 'guard' (MA).

MoL: qaraul 'guard, watch, scout' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: charuul 'karaul, watch, guard' (KhL), charuul 'id.' (BurL), xarēl 'custody' (Üjüm), xarōl 'karaul' (DahHP), karō 'id.' (Dahlv); W: xarūl (OirK), xarūl 'border sentry' (Kalm), qaraūl 'outpost' (MogZ).

Chuvash: xural 'watch, guard, karaul' (Sirotkin 1961), xural tär- 'to be on guard', xuralśě 'watch, bodyguard' (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xural, xoral 'watch, guard, night guard' (Ašmarin XVI, p.211).

Volga Kipchak: karavil 'guard' (TatL), qaravil 'id.' (BashkL).

Cheremis: orol' 'guard' (Räsänen 1920, p.170, MRS).

The word spread from Manchu to Swahili, from Russian to Arabic everywhere as a military term of the Mongolian epoch (see the data in Doerfer I, pp.399-403, Räsänen 1969, pp.235-6, Egorov 1964, p.304). The word is the derivative of the Mongolian verb gara- 'to see, to watch' with a -yul suffix (Cf. Poppe 1927, p.101). The Chuvash word is a direct adoption from Mongolian. The Mongolian origin of the Chuvash word had already been pointed out by Räsänen (1920, p.171). The second vowel of the Chuvash word originally may have been an -o-, as is indicated by the Cheremis form.

26. MMo garčiga 'falcon'

Mongolian: MMo: E: garčiqai 'falcon' (SH), garčiqai 'id.' (Hy); W: q^arčiqai 'id.' (AL), garčiga 'hawk' (MA).
MoL: garčaga, garčagai 'falcon, hunting bird' (Lessing).
ModMo: E: charcaga, charcagay 'hawk' (KhL), charsaga 'id.' (BurL), gartšagā 'buzzard' (Ord), xaršig 'id.' (Jar); W: xartaag 'falcon' (OirK), xarts^aā 'hawk' (Kalm).
Chuvash: xurčka 'hawk' (Sirotkin 1961), xurčaka 'buzzard' (Paasonen 1908, Sp), xurčka, xorčka, 'hawk' (Ašmarin XVI, p.236).
Volga Kipchak: karčiga 'hawk' (TatL), karčəga, garčəga 'id.' (TatP), qarsiga 'id.' (BashkL), karsəga 'buzzard' (BashkP).

The word reached several Turkic languages, and moreover Mordvin, Vogul, Ostyak, Manchu, Russian, Persian, and the languages of the Caucasus, and even Korean (Cf. Doerfer, I, pp.404-405, Räsänen 1969, p.237, Egorov 1964, p.309, Lee 1964, p.191) as a hunting term. Because of -x- the word is a rather late loan in Chuvash, presumably of Tatar mediation, but its adoption was at a time prior to the a > o development. The initial x- can be a substitution as well from a time when there was no initial qa- in Chuvash.

27. MMo quda 'relative obtained through marriage'

Mongolian: MMo: E: quda 'brother-in-law' (SH), quda 'two families related through marriage of their children' (Hy); W: --.

MoL: quda 'heads of two families related through marriage of their children' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: quda 'father-in-law (svat)' (KhL), chuda 'id.' (BurL), xuda 'heads or male members of two families related by marriage, male guests invited to marriage feast' (Ord), gudā 'id.' (Mgr); W: xud^u 'in-laws, relations by marriage' (Kalm).

Chuvash: xāta 'suitor' (Sirotkin 1961), xāta, xōta 'suitor, sponsor' (Paasonen 1908, Sp).

Volga Kipchak: koda 'male relatives of the bridegroom, for the bride and her relatives, suitor' (TatL), koḏa 'id.'

(BashkL).

The word, which was adopted by several Turkic languages, and by Mordvin, Votyak and Persian (Cf. Doerfer I, pp.423-25, Räsänen 1969, p.296, Egorov 1964, p.295, Poppe 1927a, p.155) is consequently regarded by Doerfer (1962, p. 260) as a Tatar loan in Chuvash. This has no criterion whatsoever. If it still happens to be a Tatar loan then it belongs to the most archaic layer, because the Tat. ko < ⁺qu syllable had preserved its initial k- in the later loans (Cf. PT qural 'tool' > Tat. koral → Chuv kāral, see below p). The definite Mongolian origin of the word is testified by the retained -d- (the -t- of Chuvash orthography is pronounced as D), which, in the case of original -d- would have been -y- in the Volga Kipchak languages, and -r- in Chuvash.

28. MMo siltaŋ 'cause'

Mongolian: MMo: E: šiltaŋ, šilta'a 'cause' (SH), šiltan, šilta'an 'id.' (Hy, HyAB), šiltā 'id.' (HyB), šilt'a- 'to give a handle for something, to use evasions' (Ph); W: šiltaq 'pretext' (MA).

MoL: siltaŋ 'cause, pretext, trick' (Lessing).

ModMo: E: šaltag 'id.' (KhL) šaltag 'id.' (BurL), šiltak 'id.' (Ord); W: šaltag 'id.' (Kalm).

Chuvash: sältav 'occasion, pretext, motive, cause' (Sirotkin 1961), sältav (Ašmarin XI, p.243), sälttav (loc. cit.).

p.244) 'id.' sältäk 'fault, shortcoming, cause, manner' (Sirotkin 1961, dial).

Volga Kipchak: siltau 'pretext, excuse' (TatL), silta- 'to seek pretexts, to use excuses, to make excuses' (TatL); hiltau 'excuse, pretext' (BashkL), hiltaula- 'to seek excuses, to use pretexts, to make excuses'.

Cheremis: siltik 'occasion, cause, stratagem' (MRS, Fedotov 1965, p.110).

The earliest occurrence of the word in the Turkic languages is in the Codex Cumanicus, the editor of which regarded our item to be a Mongolian word. It exists in several Turkic languages as well (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p. 416, Doerfer I, pp.358-360). The Volga languages, including Cheremis too, indicate a transferring si- and not a ši- syllable. In the Volga Kipchak languages the ši- syllable was originally unknown, thus it may be in part the result of sound substitution. In Chuvash the word is of Tatar origin but it is interesting to note that the form with -k- has not yet been traced in the Volga Kipchak languages. The -av terminal refers to a fairly recent adoption (Cf. Chuv. karlav 'forked curry-comb' ← Tat. karlau, Chuv. xutav 'peck' ← Tat. qadau). The Volga Kipchak verbal forms are secondary derivatives of Mongolian origin. The ancient, and perhaps related Turkic word is filtay, which would have been ⁺tiltau in Ta-

tar and ⁺čelte in Chuvash.

29. MMo sayi 'good'

Mongolian: MMo: E: sayi, sayin 'good, correct' (SH), sayin 'id.' (Hy, HyA), sayin (Ph); W: sayin 'true, healthy' (IMM, IMT), sayin 'good' (AL), sayin 'id.' (MA), sayin 'id.' (VI).

MoL: sayin 'good' (Lessing)

ModMo: E: sayn 'good' (KhL), hayn 'id.' (BurL), sān 'id.' (Ord), sān 'id.' (Jar), sen 'id.' (Dahlv), sain 'id.' (DahM), šai 'id.' (DahTsL), sēn 'id.' (Mgr), saṅ 'id.' (Pao): W: sān 'id.' (OirK, Kalm), sāin 'right' (MogR, MrL, ML).

Chuvash: sayă 'good' (Sirotkin 1961, dial., Ašmarin XI, p.4).

Cheremis: say 'good' (Räsänen 1923, p. 58, MRS).

The word occurs in Kirghiz too, but there it is only used in connection with race-horses and this may have been the cause of its spread in the Volga-region as well. The word has not yet been traced in the Volga Kipchak languages, but both the Chuvash as well as the Cheremis words are of Tatar origin. The Mongolian word cannot be separated from the PT saṣ 'good, healthy, clean, right side' (Cf. Räsänen 1969, p. 394, the word saṣ is missing from its alphabetic place, Poppe 1960a, pp. 29, 61, 137), and goes back to an earlier ⁺saṣi form. A PT saṣ would

have become su in Chuvash (Cf. su- 'to milk' < say-).

Conclusions regarding the MMo

linguistic condition

The MMo disyllables of identical vowels (V₁V₂) had already become long (6, 8), whereas the disyllables containing different vowels (V₁V₂) are still reflected in the diphthongs (16). The vowel of the second open syllable had frequently been dropped (1, 2, 9), or alternating can be traced (26). The most important feature is the western Mongolian characteristic of the vocalisation of the second syllable as reflected in our material which shows the il-labial variant without exception (4, 5, 7, 15, 19, 22, 23). The 'breaking' of i has not yet taken place (10, 28). The MMo h- is not reflected in this material (15). Chuvash x- corresponds to the Mongolian velar q (14, 24, 25, 26, 27), but this may be a Chuvash substitution as well. The same applies also to the back ɣ (5, 14, 17, 22). In late loans and in those of definitely Tatar transmission the original guttural plosives appear in Chuvash as plosives (19, 26, 28), but since there was no x- Tatar, therefore this phenomenon does not provide any footing to the chronology of the western Mongolian q > x development. The dual Tatar correspondence of the terminal -ɣ (-u ~ -k 28) suggests the inference that in the lending language there was a voiceless medial G, as in the case of a voiced plosive

one would expect only an -u, and in the case of a voiceless fortis a -k correspondence. The si- syllable has not yet become ši- in a back voiced word, but this may be a Tatar substitution as well.

Conclusions regarding Chuvash Phonology

The most important conclusions are of a chronological nature. The following changes are later than the words of Mongolian origin:

1. $\overset{\circ}{a} > o, u$ (1, 2, 17, 25, 26). Consequently the words where an a has been retained - a Chuvash e reflects a Tatar $a > \overset{\circ}{a}$ development - are of rather late Tatar origin (20, 24, 29 and 16).

2. $\overset{\circ}{a} > a$ (3, 18), $e > i$ (11, 12, 13). The fact that the Mongolian e has two different reflections in Chuvash, may have several reasons. It is possible that there was an original $\overset{\circ}{a}:e$ opposition in the borrowing language, and Mongolian (where such an opposition did not exist) had such an e sound which did not coincide with either of the two. Thus two kinds of sound substitution evolved. We may imagine also that the $\overset{\circ}{a}$ and e were not in phonematic opposition in Chuvash but that they occurred as phonetic variants which subsequently phonematized. But it is definite in both cases, that the $\overset{\circ}{a} > a$ and $e > i$ changes in Chuvash, and the latter in the Volga Kipchak languages, are from a time after the Mongolian epoch.

3. o > Viry. ö, An. ǎ, u, ŭ > Viry. ö, An. ǎ (4, 9, 22, 27). Whereas in two cases the reduction did not take place (5, 7), which may have had dialectal reasons, at the same time a change may be observed also e.g. in word 13, and in the word puśaxa, where the analogic impact of the word puś- may have played some role. The Tatar adoption may also explain the lack of reduction.

4. i > ǎ (10, 11, 28) which indirectly means that the appearance of the Chuvash i corresponding to the PT a is quite a new phenomenon.

5. ū > ǎvǎ ~ u (6), but ū > u > ö, ǎ (8). The long ū as represented by ǎvǎ, is not unknown in Chuvash. (PT ū 'tinder' > ǎvǎ ~ u).

6. oi > ui > u (14) which is important as regards the chronology of the development of secondary Chuvash u.

7. The reduction of the closed vowels in other than first syllables (4, 8, 14, 29) is also reflected in the loan-words, where sound substitution may also have taken place naturally.

In the sphere of consonants the unvoicing of the initial voiced ones can be observed: b > p (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), d > t (11, 12), but here the Mongolian loan-words do not provide any footing to the chronology of the phenomenon, though it is highly probable that the process began later than the thirteenth century, yet in theory sound sub-

stitution may have also taken place. If already at the time of borrowing there was only initial p- in Chuvash, then the lending b- could only be reflected with p-. The spirantization of the back guttural plosives (k, g) of Chuvash may have already taken place before the Mongolian epoch as is indicated by the Volga-Bulgarian inscriptions among others, therefore the Mong. q, ɣ > Chuv. x ~ xx correspondences are most probably also the results of sound substitution. In one case (16) the Mongolian ɣ and ɣ had become ś, and ɣ in all other cases (4, 9, 10, 16, 24, 26). This indicates that the spirantization of the affricates was practically complete by the time of adopting the Middle Mongolian loan-words. As until the end of the fourteenth century there are still affricates in the Volga-Bulgarian inscriptions, these words should be regarded as borrowings later than the fourteenth century. As in two of the above words (9, 26) the ā > o, u development also occurs, on this basis it can be definitely dated as post-fourteenth century.

On the n > m development, and the n > m alteration see p .

Conclusions regarding the Chuvash Loan- -Words in the Cheremis Language

The very fact, that out of the 29 Middle Mongolian words of Chuvash 17 exist also in Cheremis, indicates,

that the bulk of the Chuvash and Tatar loans in Cheremis are later than the Mongolian epoch, i.e. later than the thirteenth century. The greater part of the Middle Mongolian words adopted by Cheremis are of Tatar transmission, and for the remaining portion we have no criteria to decide whether the given word is of Tatar, or of Chuvash origin in Cheremis. Words 3, 16, 18 and 25 are definitely of Chuvash origin. These indicate that the $\underline{s}^- > \underline{s}^-$ and $\underline{x}^- \sim \underline{\emptyset}^-$ developments in Cheremis are from the post-Mongolian epoch and item 28 shows that the $\underline{s}^- > \underline{\gamma}^-$ development is also later than the Mongolian era. From the very fact that the Chuvash $\underline{\overset{\circ}{a}} > \underline{o}, \underline{u}$ or $\underline{\overset{\circ}{a}} > \underline{a}$ development is also reflected in Cheremis words 25, 3 and 18, we may infer that all those other Chuvash loan-words, where the same phenomenon is reflected, were borrowings after the thirteenth century. And this is a statement concerning the majority of the Chuvash loan words in Cheremis.

It is commonly known that there is a debate going on among scholars on the correspondences of Meadow Cheremis $\underline{a} \sim$ Mountain Cheremis $\underline{\overset{\circ}{a}}$, and Meadow $\underline{o} \sim$ Mountain \underline{a} . According to Gombocz (1909-10, p. 249), Wichmann (1923-24, pp. 44-45) and Itkonen (1969, pp. 243-246) the $\underline{\overset{\circ}{a}}$ and $\underline{a/\overset{\circ}{a}}$ are older, whereas according to Räsänen (1920, pp. 79-81), Beke (1935, pp. 68-69) and Bereczki (1968, p. 30, 1971, pp. 25-27) the Mountain Cheremis $\underline{\overset{\circ}{a}}$ and \underline{a} are sec-

ondary. Two of the words of Middle Mongolian origin occur in Mountain Cheremis: parʃa (13) (Ramstedt 1902, Tr, Bud, Cf. Räsänen 1920) and orolâ, orolaš, xoro'laš (25) (Ramstedt 1902). But in these two words there is no ä, or a. In the Chuvash loan-words of the Cheremis language the following correspondences are known:

- | | |
|---|---|
| $\begin{array}{l} x \\ \text{ä} \end{array} > \text{Chuv. } \underline{a} \rightarrow$ | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meadow, Mountain <u>a</u> 2. Meadow <u>a</u> ~ Mountain <u>ä</u> |
| $\begin{array}{l} x \\ \text{ä} \\ x \\ \text{o} \\ x \\ \text{u} \end{array} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \backslash \\ / \end{array} \right. \text{Chuv. } \underline{o} \rightarrow$ | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meadow, Mountain <u>o</u> 2. Meadow <u>o</u> ~ Mountain <u>a</u>. |

Though in our material there are only two such words that belong to this group, yet it is remarkable that both of them can be classified under category one. The question is what is the chronological relationship between the two categories.

It has not yet been considered that the x ~ ø correspondence is characteristic of the words belonging to the first category in Meadow and Mountain Cheremis (PT qadīn 'brother-in-law, father-in-law' > qayīn → Chuv. qayn > xon → Mountain on, Meadow on, see further examples in Räsänen 1920, p. 83, whereas in words of the second category in Mountain Cheremis the x- has been retained (PT qan 'khan' > Chuv. xon → Mountain xan ~ Meadow on, or Arabic → Chuv. xarsär 'diligent'

→ Mountain xārsār, Meadow arsār, see further 15 examples in Räsänen 1920, p.22). Had Cheremis adopted words of the second category prior to those of the first one, it would be incomprehensible for a ~~ʃ~~ - to be retained in Mountain Cheremis.

The most probable solution seems to be the following: Common Cheremis had no initial ~~ʃ~~-. The earlier Chuvash loan-words, which had an initial ~~ʃ~~ - were adopted without this sound. Later under the massive influence of Chuvash the initial ~~ʃ~~ - developed in Mountain Cheremis and in consequence in later, already separately borrowed Chuvash words the ~~ʃ~~ - has been preserved.

It is rather interesting that those Tatar loan-words in the Cheremis language that belong to category one still show the conditions prior to the Tatar o > u development (see examples in Räsänen 1923, pp.14-5). Words belonging to the second category are of a time after the u > o development, e.g. PT yuldaş 'companion' > Tat. yoldaş → Mountain yaldaş, Meadow yoldaş, PT yumaq 'legend' > Tat. dial yomak 'riddle' → Mountain yamak, Meadow yomak. A section of the Tatar words reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation. Thus e.g. the PT qān- 'to rest, to repose' > Tat. kan- → Chuv. kan- → Mountain kān- ~ Meadow kan-. The fact that this word reached Cheremis by Chuvash mediation is shown by a derivative of

the verb: Chuv. kanáśśär 'turbulent, restless' → Mountain kānəsər, Meadow kanəsər. In fact three chronological layers of Tatar loan-words in Chuvash can be easily isolated:

1. Tat. ka → Chuv. xu- (e.g. kaška 'white spot on head of horse' → Chuv. xuška)
2. Tat. ka → Chuv. xa- (e.g. kapka 'gate' → Chuv. xapxa)
3. Tat. ka → Chuv. ka- (karčik 'old' → Chuv. karčäk).

Thus the Mountain Cheremis kānəsər belongs to the third layer and as such it is a very recent one, yet the a > ā development has taken place in it. Therefore it appears, that the Middle Mongolian loan-words, the internal and related sound-changes in Chuvash and Tatar all indicate that the Mountain Cheremis a > ā, and o > a development is relatively new and it is by no means a retained archaism.

One problem however still remains to be solved. If we presume that Cheremis took over the Chuvash o as o in the words of category one, and later both Cheremis dialects retained it as o, then why did the Chuvash o become an a in Mountain Cheremis of the second category? The two sounds, i.e. the one remaining o and the other becoming a cannot be of identical origin in Mountain Cheremis. We have to presume that in the words of the second category Mountain Cheremis did not adopt the Chu-

vash o as o, but as ä, and not a as a, but as ä:

Category one

Meadow

Chuv. o →

Mountain

o
↑
o
↓
o

a
↑
a
↓
a

← Chuv. a

Category two

Meadow

Chuv. o --

Mountain

o
↑
a
↓
a

ä
↑
ä
↓
ä

← Chuv. a

The existence of the labial ä in Cheremis has been postulated by several scholars (Cf. Serebennikov 1957, pp.224-230, Itkonen 1969, p.217, Collinder 1960, p.153, etc.), and the slightly palatalized ä exists until now in the Mountain dialects of Cheremis (Cf. Sovremennyj 1960, p.48). At the time of category two there was obviously a phonetic difference between the Chuvash o and the o of Mountain Cheremis, this is why Mountain Cheremis adopted the Chuvash o as ä and the position of a may have been similar. For the final settlement of these problems Chuvash-Cheremis contrastive phonetics is needed.

+++

In conclusion a few words should be devoted to the role of the Mongols in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries as reflected by the loan-words. It is not by coincidence that most of the Mongolian words here referred to, can be

found not only in the Volga languages but in several other ones as well, in all the languages that had come into contact with the conquests of the Chinggissid empire. Though it is true that the words adopted by Chuvash represent only a fragment of the words borrowed from the Mongols by the various other languages, yet they faithfully represent those three main fields where the Mongolian impact was the strongest. With the Mongols a special kind of horse breeding had spread (3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 22, 29), and it is again under the influence of the Mongols that one kind of hunting with birds of prey had become common practice (7, 18, 26). The Mongols had an impact on the social relations and organization that should not be underestimated (1, 2?, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 25). The full image will naturally unfold only after the compilation of all the loan-words of the Mongolian epoch. This image will reflect the impact which the Mongolian conquest had on Eurasia.

ABBREVIATIONS

Mongolian

- AL Mongolian glosses of the anonymous work,
the Tarjūmān turkī wa aĵamī wa muġati
(Houtsma 1894, Kuryŷĵanov 1970 and
Poppe 1927)
- BurL Literary Buriat (Čeremisov 1951)

Dahlv	Dagur (Ivanovskij 1894)
DahHP	Dagur, Hailar dial. (Poppe 1930)
DahM	Dagur (Martin 1961)
DahMu	Dagur, Muromsky (Kałużynski 1969-70)
DahTsL	Dagur, Tsitsikar dial. (Ligeti 1933)
Drg	Dariganga (Róna-Tas 1961)
E	Eastern
Golstunskij	Literary Mongolian (Gol'stunskij 1893-1896)
Hy	The Chinese-Mongolian dictionary <u>Hua-yi yi-yu</u> (Ligeti 1968, Lewicki 1949-1959 and Haenisch 1957)
HyA, B	The documents of the <u>Hua-yi yi-yu</u> , see Hy
IMI	The Istanbul manuscript of Ibn Muhannā's dictionary (Poppe 1938, Eren 1950 and Weiers 1972)
IMM	The Melioranskij manuscript of Ibn Muhanna's dictionary (Melioranskij 1904)
Jar	Jarut (Kara 1970)
Kalm	Kalmuck (Ramstedt 1935)
KhL	Literary Khalkha (Luvsandéndév. 1957)
KhC	Literary Khalkha (Cévé1 1966)
Kowalewski	Literary Mongolian (Kowalewski 1844-1849)
Lessing	Literary Mongolian, as found in Lessing's dictionary
MMo	Middle Mongolian

MA	Mongolian words of a 15th-century manuscript of the <u>Mukkadimat-al-Adab</u> (Poppe 1938)
Mgr	Monguor (Smedt-Mostaert 1933)
ModMo	Modern Mongolian
MogK	Moghol, Kudir manuscript (Shinobu Iwamura 1961, Ligeti 1968 and Homan 1972)
MogL	Moghol, Leech's material in Ligeti 1954
MogMrL	Moghol, Marda dial. (Ligeti 1964)
MogMSL	Moghol, Marda dial. Ligeti's collection from the Sabit and Arzanabad region, see MogMrL
MogR	Moghol (Ramstedt 1905)
MogZ	Moghol, see MogK
OirK	Western Mongolian oirat (Kara 1959)
Ord	Ordos (Mostaert 1942-1944)
Pao	Pao an (Todaeva 1964)
Ph	Middle Mongolian linguistic monuments in the ᠬᠦᠫᠦᠭᠦᠰᠦ script.
Quaz	Hamdullah Qazvinni's Mongolian glosses (Pelliot 1931)
SH	<u>Secret History of the Mongols</u> (Haenisch 1939 and Ligeti 1971)
VI	Mongolian words of the quadrilingual

	dictionary of Istanbul (Ligeti 1962)
W	West
<u>Volga Kipchak</u>	
TatL	Literary Tatar (<u>TRS 1966</u>)
Tat REW	Räsänen 1969
TatDS	Data of Tatar Dialects (<u>TTDS</u>)
TatP	Data of Tatar Dialects according to Paasonen (Kecskeméti 1965)
TatR	Tatar (Radloff 1893)
BashkL	Literary Bashkir (<u>BRS</u>)
BashkP	Bashkir (Pröhle 1903-1905)
<u>Chuvash</u>	
Aŷm	Chuvash data of Aŷmarin's <u>Thesaurus</u> , Cf. Aŷmarin.
L	Literary Chuvash (Sirotkin 1961)
P	Paasonen's Chuvash glossary (Paasonen 1908)
Sp	Data from Spask in Paasonen's glossary (Paasonen 1908)
PR	Räsänen's manuscript notes to Paasonen's glossary from 1915-1917, quoted by courtesy of I. Kecskeméti
UChP	Paasonen's data from a Chuvash text-book

POSTSCRIPT

This is an unaltered translation of my paper written
in Hungarian (Róna-Tas 1971-1972, 1973-1974). At the

14th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference held in 1971, Szeged, Hungary, I read a paper on The Altaic Theory and the History of a Middle Mongolian Loan Word in Chuvash, where I dealt with some theoretical implications concerning the "Altaic theory" in connection with the origin of the Chuvash usra- (No. 2 above). This paper was published in English in Researches in Altaic Languages (Ed. by L. Ligeti, 1975). In a paper entitled On Chuvash-Mongolian Linguistic Contacts (Poppe 1977) Poppe commented on my paper published in 1975. He summed up his view in the following: "The Mongolian loan words in Chuvash, investigated by A. Róna-Tas, entered Chuvash through the medium of a neighboring Turkic language, such as Tatar, Bashkir, etc. All of the words in question occur also in Turkic and appear in their Turkic forms and with Turkic semantics in Chuvash. Only one does not occur in Turkic, but nor is it Mongolian" (p. 111). Poppe is right when he rejects the ultimate Mongolian origin of Chuv. kărsaka 'quick, tempered, nervous' which I included in the list given in Róna-Tas 1975 but myself deleted from Róna-Tas 1971-74 which was written later, but published earlier.

As to the essence of the question I quote the relevant passage from Róna-Tas 1975 (p. 206, i.e. from the paper which Poppe discussed): "From the above it can be conclud-

ed that the following words surely are of Tatar origin [15 items enumerated]. It is clear that items 10 and 28 with their a → ä > u development are earlier than 19b, 22, 26, 30 and 31, where a has been preserved. In the case of Chuv. usra- (and upra-) we have no criteria for the Tatar medium and thus cannot decide whether they are directly borrowed from MMo or through Tatar: but the second possibility is more probable." I think that from this quotation it is clear that I myself was also of the opinion that the bulk of the loan-words in question came into Chuvash with Tatar mediation (Bashkir is less probable). I have, however, to admit that the term 'Middle Mongolian loan-word in Chuvash' is somewhat misleading, and therefore I use the formulation 'Loan-words of ultimate Middle Mongolian origin in Chuvash' as suggested by Poppe. Where I disagree with Poppe is more a methodological question. In all cases where we have clear phonetic criteria for Tatar mediation we agree with Poppe. Poppe's two other criteria are, however, not conclusive. The fact that "all of them occur not only in Ch[uvash] but also in the neighboring T[urkic] languages. There is not a single word among them that occurs only in Ch[uvash]" would not be a relevant argument even if it were true. Chuvash itself is a Turkic language, spoken in the Volga-region in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, so their

ancestors also could borrow from the Mongolian upper strata loan-words, and for historical and cultural reasons the very same ones, which the other languages did in the same area. As to the "Turkic semantics" of the Middle Mongolian loan-words we have to distinguish two features. In some cases the Volga Turkic semantics reflect a special Western Mongolian one - as does their phonetic shape. In some other cases we have to deal with a special areal development not limited to Tatar but relevant to all Volga Turkic languages. As to the details I have nothing to add with the exception of one case. To the disyllabic form parka (as in Mongolian) versus the monosyllabic form in Turkic i.e. berk Poppe adds: "it is well known that Chuvash often has an epithetic vowel on words corresponding to T[urkic] monosyllables" (op.cit. p. 114). Poppe has overlooked the fact that in all relevant cases this epithetic vowel is a reduced one which is not the case with parka. The etymological final -ă/ě is on its way to disappearance because of its unstressed position and in such cases hyperurbanic -ă/ě is appearing also in words where earlier there had never been vocalic finals.

Since the above text is an unaltered translation of Róna-Tas 1971-1974 I have not made special references to Poppe 1977.

Notes

- 1 See e.g. Serruys (1967). Mongolian glosses in Chinese script naturally have to be separated from the Mongolian loan-words incorporated into the Chinese language. Serruys's article deals with real loan-words. Cf. also Laufer (1916), Mayrhofer (1960), Konkaspaev (1959), Németh (1953). Ligeti (1962, p. 148) has pointed out that the Hungarian dialectal word daku 'short overcoat like a sheepskin waistcoat' is a Middle Mongolian word of Cumanian transmission. The same word also exists in Chinese in the form ta-hu (see Serruys, op.cit.). It will suffice to run through the Russian etymological dictionary of Vasmer to see how many Middle Mongolian words are adopted in Russian, mainly with Turkic mediation.

- 2 Egorov identifies the word nar, occurring in the Chuvash expression nar pek xitre but unknown in Chuvash in independent use, with the Mongolian word nara, obviously having in mind some meaning such as 'beautiful like the Sun'. The word nar occurs in Modern Chuvash in several instances expressing intensity: nar pek xěrlě 'very red', nar pek samăr 'very greasy'. Ašmarin (IX, p. 8) notes that the word, the ancient meaning of which is now forgotten, may express some specifically good quality with such features as 'complete', 'flourishing', 'pure', 'beautiful', since it is frequently used to describe girls. He suggests that the word may be in some relation to the nar meaning 'pomegranate' quoted in Radlov's dictionary. This view has been accepted by Räsänen (1969, p. 350) as well. The word cannot be Mongolian because of phonetic reasons too, as in Chuvash a Mongolian a, would have become o, u. It is an obvious loan from Tatar where there are two such words: nar 'pomegran-

ate' and nar 'dromedary', both of Persian origin. It cannot be excluded that the two words mixed in Chuvash in so far as the original meaning was 'pomegranate' ('as beautiful as a pomegranate') but its function expressing intensity developed by a semantic extension covering the meaning of the other one (see beastly large etc.). Even the phonetic form of the Chuvash word njuxa is curious. The word is transcribed by Egorov in his quoted work with n and ju whereas in his etymological dictionary it is given with an n and palatalization mark. In the old Cyrillic-Chuvash alphabet of Jakovlev there was no doubt a letter ñ. But such an initial sound exists in Chuvash only in a single group of words, those of children's language. Such are the words e.g. ñam 'food', ñanne 'grandmother', ñani, ñana 'dear', ñanam 'my dear', etc. Ašmarin (IX, pp. 62-64) lists among these words the word ñaxxa 'dog' noting, that this is a word of children's language. The word ñuxa is also such a word as I experienced for myself while collecting among the Chuvash people. Incidentally the Chuvash word cannot be an ancient Mongolian loan-word either because of phonetic considerations (though it cannot be excluded that the initial sound of the Mongolian word was originally also a palatalized ñ). The terminal -ai has become -i in Chuvash: PT buɣdai 'wheat' > Chuv. pări, PT turɣai 'larch-tree' > Chuv. tări, PT siçɣai 'mouse' > Chuv. šăši, etc. Similarly, the word kakaɣ 'meat' is also of children's language but it has become a common word. This word cannot be identified with the Mong. ɣaqai 'swine' either, because of phonetic reasons (the a did not remain, the ɣ had become q and x and the final sound should have become -i etc.). Egorov already correctly explains the Chuvash word tixa from a taɣa (tayxa) in his etymological dictionary and mentions that the Chuvash dialects still retain a tiyxa form as well. Yet he quotes here also the Mongolian word daaga.

- 3 Though it is probable that these words reached the Turkic peoples of the Volga-region with Mongolian mediation, I do not discuss them under separate headings because their Mongolian origin is questionable. The Mong. arɣamaɣ ultimately goes back to an ar- 'to mislead, cheat' stem which at present can be traced only in Turkic. The substantive arɣa 'contrivance, manner' and the verb of similar form arɣa- 'to machinate, to find a way' derive from it, and both exist in Mongolian. To this the -maɣ suffix is added which is also well-known in Mongolian (qarɣur-maɣ 'cheating', qoli-maɣ 'mixture', yada-maɣ 'weak', ɕida-maɣ 'able'). But this Mongolian nominal suffix -maɣ cannot be separated from the Tu, -maq suffix of identical function. The word alaɣa is only known from the Secret History of the Mongols, where it indicates a horse robbed from the Jurchen Altan khan. This word indicates a species of small horse in some Turkic languages, consequently it is related in all probabilities to the Turkic word al 'short, lower' though the derivation is not clear.

SOME VOLGA BULGARIAN WORDS IN THE VOLGA
KIPCHAK LANGUAGES⁺

by
A. RÓNA-TAS

It is a well-known fact that there are Volga Kipchak (VK) i.e. Tatar and Bashkir loan-words in Chuvash¹. On the other hand, practically no attention has been paid to the Volga Bulgarian layer of the VK languages². I would like to present here some preliminary results of a study on the latter.

The Proto-Turkic (PT) $\text{ɣ} \sim \text{y}$ and ç sounds developed in Chuvash into ś . It is a debated and yet unsolved question whether we are concerned with a development $\text{ɣ} > \text{z} > \text{ś}$ or with $\text{ɣ} > \text{ç} > \text{ś}$, i.e. the relative chronology of devoicing and spirantization is uncertain. It is clear, however, that as early as the 8th-9th centuries there already existed an Old Bulgarian dialect which had spirant consonants in place of earlier ɣ -, because Hungarian borrowed a few words from this dialect: Hung. szél [sél] 'wind' ← OB ⁺śél Chuv. > śil; Hung. szőlő [söllő] 'grapes' ← OB ⁺śeōley > Chuv. śirla; Hung. szűcs [šűč] 'tailor' ← OB ⁺śeuči > Chuv. śěvčěś (Cf. Proto-Turkic ⁺yēl 'wind', ⁺yedlig 'berry', ⁺yevci 'tailor'). The bulk of the OB loan-words in Hungarian shows a ɣ -dialect as Hung. gyümölcs [d'ümöč] 'fruit' ← OB ⁺ɣemilč > Chuv. ⁺śiměś, Hung.

⁺ First published in: Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh. Ed. by Gy. Káldy-Nagy, Budapest, pp. 169-175.

gyűrd [d'ūrū] 'ring' ← OB ⁺ŷūrū > Chuv. ⁺šērē,
Hung. gyertya [d'ert'a] 'candle' ← OB ⁺ŷarta > Chuv.
śurta etc. (Cf. PT ⁺yemiš 'fruit', ⁺yüzük 'ring' and
⁺yarta 'torch, candle').

The existence of the two Bulgarian dialects can be well demonstrated by the help of the oldest Bulgarian loan-words in Proto-Permian (PP): Zyrian kiś 'slay, weaver's reed', Votyak kiś 'id.' < PP ⁺kiś ← VB ŷis (< ⁺qilč) > Chuv. ŷēs; Zyrian ⁺śil 'wind', Votyak śil 'id.' < PP ⁺sil ← VB śil (< ⁺yēl) > Chuv. śil; but Zyrian ćarla 'sickle' < PP ⁺ćarla ← VB čarla ~ śarla → Votyak ⁺śarlā > śurlo, Cf. Chuv. śurla, Hung. sarló [śarlō]; Zyrian kuže 'forest-spirit, lord', Votyak kužo, kuzo 'id.' < PP kuža ← VB xuža ~ xuža ← Persian xwaja, Cf. Chuv. ŷuša and Russian hozja-nin³.

We have to exclude the possibility that we are dealing here with two chronologically different layers. The loan-words in Hungarian are surely earlier than the end of the 9th century while in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions⁴ we still find ŷ-, and this means that the ŷ-dialect existed at least until the middle of the 14th century⁵.

The existence of the two dialects can be demonstrated even in Chuvash itself, because such words as čakan 'bulrush' instead of the expected śakan (~ PT yākān Cf. Hung. gyékény [d'ēkēn']) can be explained only as

a loan in Chuvash from the other VB dialect (VB ĵākān → Chuv. ĵākān > ĵakan).

Now having sure and independent evidence for the existence of a ĵ- and an š-dialect of VB, we are forced to pose the question: how are these dialects reflected in the VB layer of the VK languages?

It is extremely difficult to demonstrate loan-words coming from the ĵ VB dialect into the VK languages because ĵ - is now common in the central Tatar dialects, while the Misher dialects and Bashkir have y-. In most cases the central Tatar dialects borrowed a ĵ-word without any change and Misher and Bashkir substituted y- for ĵ-⁶. I would quote only two cases where such a borrowing seems probable:⁷

1. Ĵar in Ĵašal Ĵ. 'mednyj kuporos' (TD) ← VB Ĵār (< PT yez > Tat. Ĵiz → Chuv. yěs) → Mordvin šerę, Zyrian šir (in +šir-iš, Cf. Paasonen 1953, p.124, Lytkin 1967, pp.134-135).
2. yozorok 'fist' (TatB) ← VB ĵuđurux (< PT yudruq > Tat. yodrik)⁸. It is easier to find traces of the š-dialect where the regular Tatar correspondence is š-⁹.
3. šara in šarak agač 'gladkoe, bez vetvej derevo' (TD), šārā 'golyj, bez šersti' (TatP, O Cf. Räsänen 1920, p.186) ← VB +šārā (< +čārā) >

Chuv. śara 'golyj' → Cher. sārā. The form ⁺čārā is also attested in Cher. čara, čārā (Räsänen 1920, p.189). The word cannot be connected with PT taz as Fedotov (1965, p. 116) supposed¹⁰ and its ultimate origin remains unclear.

4. šimran, šomran 'suslik' (TD), šomoran 'id.' (TP) ← VB ⁺šumran (< PT yumran > Tat. yomran → Chuv. yāmran)¹¹.
5. šil in šilʹtaq 'skolzkij' (Bashk.) ← VB ⁺šil- (< PT yil- Cf. yılan 'snake', Bashk. yılan and Chuv. śēlen).
6. širpi 'zanoza, spička' (T, Bashk) ← VB ⁺širpi (< PT čirpi > Tat. čirpi (Mahmutova 1955, p. 142), Tat. širpi → Chuv. šěrpā, Cher. šârpâ (Räsänen 1920, p.25).
7. šomar in šomarčuk 'vid griby' (TD) ← VB ⁺šumar (< PT yaɣmur 'rain') > Chuv. śumār 'rain', see also Russian šomorluk 'ženskaja verhnjaja od'ežda' (Dobrodomov 1969, p.234, Fasmer, IV p.466) according to me VB → Tat. → Russian and not VB > Chuv. → Russian because of the final -k.
8. šomirt 'čeremuha' (Tat.), šomort 'id.' (Bashk.) ← VB ⁺šumirt (< PT yumirt) > Chuv. śēměrt

- also → Kazakh šomirt, Uzbek šumurt¹².
9. šura 'sovet' (T archaic) ← VB ⁺šora (< PT yara-q > Tat. yarau 'being in accord etc.' → Chuv. yura- 'to be satisfied') > Chuv. šura-š- 'to agree with somebody'.
10. Ästerxan 'Astrahan' (Tat.) ← VB Astarxan (← Haŷ + tarqan¹³) > Chuv. Astarxan, Aštärxan.
11. käšä, käšäkä 'ključka' ← VB ⁺käšä(kä) ~ ⁺käčäkä 'goat' → Tat. käŷä, Chuv. kača, kačaka, Zyrian keć, Votyak keć and also Hung. kecske [káčkä]¹⁴.
12. poši (Tat), pīši, pöšöy, mīši, moši (TD) 'los', mīši 'id.' (Bashk) ← VB ⁺püši ← Proto-Permian ⁺püčey > Votyak pužey. Cf. Chuv. päši¹⁵.
13. kušman 'red'ka' (TD) ← VB ⁺yošman (← Proto-Vogul ⁺kočm3n) → Zyrian kušman, Cher. ušman, Mordvin kušman, Chuv. käšman, Votyak kušman¹⁶.
14. šort 'house' (TB) ← VB ⁺šurt (< PT yurt > Tat. yort) > Chuv. šurt,
15. köpšä 'dulo, stvol, trubačnyj stebel', truba' (Tat., Bashk.) ← VB ⁺küpše (< PT küpček > Tat. köpčäk) > Chuv. kěpše.
16. šüre 'spulka, cevka' (Tat., Bashk.) ← VB šürü (< PT yüzük 'ring' > Tat. yözek, Bashk. yözök 'kol'co, peresten'') > Chuv. šěře 'ring', Cf.

Tat. → Chuv. dial. šură, šūrě 'cevka', also
Baraba šörö (Radlov) etc.

The words cited above are only a fragment of the more than hundred VB words which can be documented in the VK languages. Even this small sample shows how complicated the ethnogenetical processes in the Volga-region are and how they are reflected in the lexical stock of the Volga languages. We can distinguish among the following types:

1. The VB word has been borrowed by VK and Chuvash has the regular corresponding form (3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15).
2. Finno-Ugric words have been borrowed by VB, from VB into VK and from VK into Chuvash (12, 13).
3. The VB word has been borrowed by VK while Chuvash lost it and then borrowed the regular Tatar form (1, 4).
4. The VB word has been borrowed by VK, preserved by Chuvash, but at the same time Chuvash borrowed the regular cognate from Tatar (9).
5. The VB word has been borrowed by VK, preserved by Chuvash, but later Chuvash borrowed the VK word of VB origin too (16).
6. The VB word has been borrowed by VK while

Chuvash has lost it and then borrowed the VK word of VB origin (6).

7. Chuvash borrowed directly from the other VB dialect and so did Tatar from both VB dialects (11).

The very complicated interrelationships among the Volga languages are well-reflected even in the above sample - a fragment of the entire material. From the many problems left open I would like to deal here only with one. The quoted Tatar words are in most cases dialectal and it could be argued that we are concerned here with recent Chuvash loan-words. This would of course not question the existence of ś-loan-words in Tatar but raises the problem of chronology and admits a doubt in the synchronous existence of the two dialects in the Volga-region.

This doubt can be, however, eliminated. Those examples themselves, which show that Chuvash had reborrowed or simply borrowed ś → ŷ forms from Tatar, point to a relatively high age of the Tatar words in question. Moreover there are some phonological arguments in favour of the relatively early borrowing from VB.

The first argument is ambivalent. In the VK languages there occurred a relatively late change in the vowel-system. The originally open vowels (⁺o, ⁺ö, ⁺ä, ⁺e) became closed o > u, ö > ü, ä, e > i, while the closed (⁺u, ⁺ü, ⁺i, ⁺ī) became reduced which is not marked by the recent Tatar

ortography $\underline{u} > \underline{o}$ [ö], $\underline{u} > \underline{\ddot{o}}$ [ö̈], $\underline{i} > \underline{e}$ [ě], $\underline{i} > \underline{\ddot{i}}$ [ï]. Most of the quoted Tatar and Bashkir words show this change. The VK change can be dated surely after the 14th-15th century¹⁷ most probably after the 16th century and this would mean that those words which show this development (Nos 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15) are earlier than the 16th century. Unfortunately a similar development occurred also in Chuvash. Thus, e.g. Chuv. kěpše has a form in the Viryal dialect kõpse which is phonetically the exact counterpart of Tatar kõpšā in regards to the vowel of the first syllable. Thus this argument can be used only in case if we have other arguments.

From such arguments I would quote the case of Chuv. šěměrt (No. 8) where the development was: yumirt > ŷumirt > šumirt > šimirt > šimirt > šěměrt and VK shows the phase šumirt with the later VK $\underline{u} > \underline{o}$ development. In cases on Nos 10, 11 the borrowing was earlier than the Chuvash $\underline{\ddot{a}} > \underline{a}$ development. In case No. 9 the borrowing occurred after the VB $\underline{\ddot{a}} > \underline{o}$ or before the VK $\underline{a} > \underline{\ddot{a}}$.

Fortunately we have an independent and safe data for the existence of VB $\underline{\ddot{y}} \sim \underline{\ddot{a}} \rightarrow \text{Tat. } \underline{\ddot{y}}$ from as early as the end of the 13th century. The untimely deceased and well-known Tatar scholar G.V. Jusupov published in 1972 a VB tombstone from Tatarskoe Šapkino, Kujbiševskij rajon (not to be confused with the Kujbiševskij oblast' the

former is the region of the old capital Bolgari, the latter is much souther). The peculiarity of this stone is that there are two inscriptions on its both sides respectively and a few lines on the smaller edges. The first of the two inscriptions is written in Arabic with the tult characters. This inscription is not dated and Jusupov gives tentatively the 14th century. It has escaped Jusupov's attention that this inscription shows a very close connection with another one dated on the 5th June 1291 published by many authors, among them also by Jusupov¹⁸,

The inscription of 1291 is dedicated to a lady named Sabar Il'ji, daughter of Būrāš beg. The first inscription of Šapkino contains the name of the deceased as Šeker Il'ji, daughter of ^cUtmān al-Bulḡāri. This name was read by Jusupov as Šakar-il'či. The first name can be only front vocalic, because according to the orthographic rules of the VB inscriptions the Arabic letter keph is used only in front vocalic words. In case of il'či, Jusupov's reading is correct; he gives however no explanation for it. The name is written with aleph, lam, Yim and ya; this would allow a lot of other readings, but the inscription of 1291 has aleph, ya, lam, Yim and ya which ensures the reading of the initial vowel. The reading -č- of Yim is also possible because the VB inscriptions did not use the three dotted Yim for č. I retain as transliteration -Y-

with the notion that its phonetic value could be ǰ (though after -l- an original ǰ could be pronounced also as ɣ and in this case we would have phonemically a ǰ but phonetically a ɣ).

On the other side of the tombstone of Šapkinso we find an inscription in the kufi style, also in Arabic:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. ^c Utman eǰūke | 1. Osman uncle's |
| 2. hīr-i Husayn kiyēli | 2. daughter, Husayn's daughter-in law |
| 3. mārīhum ǰeker | 3. the deceased ǰeker |
| 4. ilti ziyarat-ī rahmatu | 4. ilti's tomb. The mercy |
| 5. -l-lahi ^c alayha rahmatun | 5. of God be upon her with mercy |
| 6. wāsi ^c at | 6. abundant |

Leaving aside some problems of the second inscription¹⁹, one thing is clear, and this has been also recognized by Jusupov that we are concerned here with the same person who figures as Šeker ilčī in the first inscription and as ǰeker ilti (according to Jusupov elti) in the second inscription.

The first vowel of ilti is written in the same way as that of ilčī, i.e. only with aleph without kesra or ya, thus in both cases we can read i-, but this reading is not binding in the second case. The corresponding -ǰi ~ ti is of great importance. Recently it has been argued

by F.S.Hakimzjanov (1974) that in the inscriptions three dialects are reflected. One of them would be a y- and -z-, -š- dialect, the two other would be -r-, -l- dialects and the main difference between the latter two would be that the syllable -ti is preserved in the one and is represented by -či in the other²⁰. It is a well-known fact that the cluster ti- has developed into č- in present Chuvash²¹ but that the Hungarian loan-words do not reflect this development²² and we have therefore to suppose τ in spite of the fact that Mongolian has a similar development - that ti > či is relatively young²³. It is possible that the ti > či development did not occur in all VB dialects and in all words in the same time. I would be however cautious and hesitate to classify the VB dialects according to the occurrence or non-occurrence of the ti > či development. In a time when this development was in its initial phase the inscriptions reflect an uncertainty²⁴. In any case ilči and ilti are perfect equivalents.

For sake of correctness we have to add that the reading č in čeker is also only one of the two possible readings, the second being čeker. But this does not influence the conclusion that we have a clear case from the end of the 13th century that what was č- (or č-) in one of the VB dialects was rendered with č- by a language which was spoken - as the name of the father of the deceased lady shows - in Bulghar.

The first authentically edited and dated inscription which is not in VB but in a literary language showing the influences of the Kipchak language is dated from 1311/12. It is very interesting that also this inscription²⁵ shows many common traits with the first inscription of Šapkino, the main difference is only that the date is given in Turkic: The lady Fatima-ilči daughter of Ayyub, son of Muhammed, son of Yunus al-Bulğari died in her twentysecond year (yigirmī iki yaşında) and the date of her death was according to Hegira in the month rabī^c u-l-ahar of 711 (wafat boldī rabī^c u-l-ahar ^cermiṣḍē hiṣratdā yeti yūz on bīrdē).

From this fact we can conclude that the people who erected the inscriptions of 1291, 1311/12 and the first inscription of Šapkino, all families living in Bulghar, spoke another language than VB and this could be most probably a Kipchak language. And if this is so, than the name Šeker reflects a Kipchak pronunciation of a VB dialectal form of the VB name Yeker.

Notes

- ¹ See Ramstedt (1922-23); N. Poppe (1924, pp. 775-782, 1925, pp. 409-427, 1927, pp. 151-167). The connections between the VB and Kipchak languages have a long history. The earliest connections began in those times when the dialects of Proto-Turkic had not yet been finally formed. There are a lot of interesting isoglosses from these times such as e.g. Kipchak quyaš 'sun' Bulgarian quyal > Chuv. xēvel in front of Oguz etc.

küneš. These isoglosses show that the formation of the dialects, which became later the Kipchak and Bulgar languages respectively, took place in an area where these proto-dialects existed near by. The second period of the connections between the Kipchak and Bulgar-Onogur languages occurred while the latter had their home-land in the South. After the migration of the later Volga Bulgars to the Middle Volga-region, the contacts did not cease with the Kipchak tribes living East and South of them (Pechenegs, Cumans etc.). The fourth period began with the intrusion of the Kipchak tribes into the Middle Volga-region, the occupation of the territory of the Volga Bulgarian Khanate. During the times of the Golden Horde and the Kazan Khanate the character of the connections changed, but not their importance. It will be an important task to distinguish among the several Kipchak layers in Chuvash. I would like to remind the reader that, in addition to the type mentioned above (quyaš ~ quyal), we can distinguish e.g. among three different representations of the syllable qa- of Kipchak origin: Tat. qa → Chuv. xu: qašqa 'white spot on the head of animals' → Chuv. xuška, Tat. qa- → Chuv. xa-: Tat. qapqa 'door' → Chuv. xapxa and Tat. qa- → Chuv. ka-: Tat. qarčiq 'old man or woman' → Chuv. karčäk.

- 2 Cf. Räsänen's short remark (1920, p. 31) and that of L.S. Levitskaja (1967). Scattered remarks can be found in works dealing with the etymology of words of the Volga languages.
- 3 On the early VB loan-words in PP see Rédei--Róna-Tas 1972 and 1975.
- 4 Cf. A. Róna-Tas -- S. Fodor, 1973.
- 5 Attempts have been made to read the letter Yim as š or the like (e.g. by Katanov, 1972, p. 112 and Fedotov 1972, p. 112) but this is impossible. The letter Yim renders Y- in Arabic words and in Tatar inscriptions. The latest dated VB inscriptions are from 1357.

- 6 It is very probable that the Y- i.e. the 'Yokanie' of the central Tatar dialects is of VB origin.

- 7 In the study of the VB loan-words of the VK languages the excellent publication of the Tatar colleagues was of great help. This group of authors was headed by L. T. Mahmutova (Cf. TTDS). I also used Bálint, 1875-77 (TB) and Paasonen's material published by Kecskeméti, 1965 (TP) The literary languages of the Volga-region are quoted by their standard dictionaries.

- 8 This word goes to an earlier ⁺yumduruq, a derivation from the root yum- 'to clench the fist, to press together etc.', yumruq and yudruq are two developments of it. The Chuvash word čämär 'ball, fist' is also a loan from another VB dialect (←yumur) as čakan. The late preservation of the spirant -ǰ- in these type of words will be the object of a forthcoming paper of L.V. Clark so I shall not go into details here.

- 9 Räsänen (1920, p.31) was the first, to call attention to the correspondence Tat. š ~ Chuv. ś. He quoted the words Nos 3, 8, 15, 16 and Tat. (Radlov) širāp 'fest, stark' ~ Chuv. śirēp ~ Mari sirəp. The origin of this latter word is not clear to me.

- 10 Fedotov also connected the word with archaic Hung. szár [sār] 'bald' which is also impossible because of the vocalism and the vocalic word-end of the VB word. His reference to Tat. šārā is correct.

- 11 The form somoran quoted by Paasonen (TP p.37) is either a misprint or a secondary š > s development, as in Ästerxan.

- 12 The PT form of this word can be reconstructed with the help of Kumandu Kiži d'imirt (Baskakov), Khakass nimirt etc., regular corresponding forms to PT ⁺yumirt.

- 13 The first component of the word is of Arabic origin. The second is the well-known title tarqan.
- 14 This crook (kljuška) is used in ball games and resembles a goat's horn, hence its name. The Chuvash word has both meanings according to Ašmarin. There is also a dialectal word in Tatar kāzā 'kozly dlja raspilka drov ili dosok' i.e. goat-footed trestle for sawing.
- 15 It is not entirely impossible that this word was directly borrowed by Chuvash from PP. The development of PP ey in VB and Chuvash to i is regular, Cf.: PT buydai 'wheat' > Chuv. pāri, PT turʔai 'lark' > Chuv. tāri, PT sičʔai 'mouse' > Chuv. šāši etc.
- 16 On kušman see K.Rédei-- Róna-Tas 1976.
- 17 According to Doerfer (1971, col. 329) these changes occurred later than the end of the 17th century. Doerfer quotes Russian sources from the time of the Kazan Khanate (1445-1552) where names of Kazan Tatars have the earlier form as Temür instead of the modern timir. I fully agree with Doerfer that the Russian sources have to be used as sources on the history of the Turkic languages. I am however sure that he also will agree with me that here some caution will be appropriate. Such well-known names as Temir are not necessarily noted in the dialect of their owner. In any case the Middle Mongolian loan-words of Tatar (see Róna-Tas 1971-1972, 1973-1974) show that all of them took part in the change in question. This is a clear argument in favour of the fact that the change of the Tatar vowel system is later than the 14th century.
- 18 G.V. Jusupov, 1960, No. 4 with earlier bibliography. I have republished this important inscription in: Róna-Tas 1973, pp.48-49 and had the opportunity to study

the stone itself in 1973. The Arabic text of the Šapino inscription is a shortened variant of the text of the 1291 stone.

- 19 On the interesting words eŷuke (ečūke) Cf. Chuv. ěśkey 'brother-in-law, appellation used by women to address married men elder than their husband' and kiyēli (kjeli) ~ PT kelin 'bride, daughter-in-law' I shall comment at another place.

- 20 To tell the truth, Hakimzjanov formulated his criteria more complicated. According to him there were a ŷ-dialect, a y-dialect and a t-dialect. But the ŷ-dialect and the t-dialect differ only in the fact that in the first we find ŷi- (Hakimzjanov does not pay the necessary attention to the fact that this is the case only before -ŷ/-i-) - while the t-dialect has t. From this fact itself it has to be clear that the ŷim in all cases where it is paralleled by t- in the other inscriptions has to be read phonemically as [č].

- 21 Cf. PT tiz 'knee' > Chuv. čēr (kuśsi), til 'tongue' > Chuv. čēlxē, tirnaq 'nail, claw' > Chuv. čērne, yēti 'seven' Chuv. šičē etc.

- 22 Cf. Hung. tér-d 'knee' ← OB tīr (-d is a Hung. dimin. suffix), tyúk, tik 'hen' < OH *tiuuk ← OB tīquq Cf. Chuv. čāx(đ), etc.

- 23 This rule is still applicable, e.g. the very young Russian loan-word in Chuvash sad 'garden' has its form with the possessive suffix i > ě: sačē [saŷē] as such original Chuvash words as yat 'name' yačē or šurt 'house' šurčē.

- 24 That Hakimzjanov's classification is unacceptable can be seen from the fact that we find in one and the same inscription -ti and -ŷi [-či] forms as: ŷiyēti 'seven' but tūweŷim 'fourth' instead of tūwetim (1353-54, Ašit, Epigr. Bulg. No 26), ŷiyēti 'seven' but

eji instead of eti < erti 'has been' (1323 Atrajsy, Epigr. Bulg. No 18), while in other inscriptions (as 1338 Tat. Kirmeni, Epigr. Bulg. No 20, 1340 Nižnie Jaki Epigr. Bulg. No. 39) we find jiyeji and even jiye. To this I have to add that in present Chuvash PT yēti is šičē but tūwātim 'fourth' (see above tūwejim) törtim is tāvatām, and not tāvačām.

25 G.V. Jusupov 1960, No. 10.

THREE VOLGA KIPCHAK ETYMOLOGIES⁺

by

A. RONA-TAS

The complicated ethnogenetical processes of the Volga peoples are well-reflected in the relationship of their respective languages. Especially complicated is the connection between Volga-Kipchak (VK) (i.e. Bashkir and Kazan Tatar) and the Chuvash language. Before the 14th century a highly important people, the Volga Bulgarians (VB) lived on their territory and even today the debate about the historical relationship of the present Volga Turkic people and the Volga Bulgarians has not been concluded. It is obvious that Chuvash is the nearest to the language of the Volga Bulgarians, i.e. the Volga Bulgarians spoke a language of Chuvash type, while the present Kazan Tatar and Bashkir belong to the Volga branch of the Kipchak group of Turkic languages. According to this it would be an over-simplification to conclude that the modern Chuvash population and language are direct descendants of the Volga Bulgarians and that the whole body of Volga Kipchaks moved to their present dwelling-place after the 13th century during the time of the Golden Horde, and that their connection with the Bulgarians began only here and at this time. This is contradicted not only by the majority of the historical sources on the Bashkirs but by several other facts, too.

⁺ First published in Hungarian: Három volgai kipszak etimológia: Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae Sectio Ethnographica et Linguistica XXI (1977), pp. 293-298.

The complicated ethnogenetical processes are well-reflected in the Volga Kipchak languages. In the following I shall examine three words of VK religious terminology. The majority of the VK religious terms are of Arabic-Persian origin, but a few of them are of Turkic origin and these are extremely valuable from an ethnogenetical point of view.

Tat. izge 'svjaščennyj, svjatoj, blagoj, dobryj, blagočestvyj, asket, svjatoša', Bashk. izge 'svjatoj, svjaščennyj, blagočestvyj, početnyj, dobryj, horošyj'.

The basic meaning of the word is 'holy, good' and in the light of VK phonology we can reconstruct an earlier ⁺ezgi form. This form can actually be found in Kazakh where it came from the Volga Kipchak languages together with many other words. The word ezgü 'good' recorded among the Anatolian-Turkish dialects comes most likely from the language of an immigrant ethnic group (Derleme Sözlüğü V, p. 1829).

Radloff (I, c. 1543) took notice of this word and he properly connected it with the Old Turkic word edgü 'good'. According to him the Tatar and Kazakh data: "...durch die Schriftsprache erhaltene und der dschagataischen Orthographie nach gelesene Uigurische Wort ätkü (properly edgü)".

Räsänen (1969, p. 36; here reference to Poppe 1927,

p. 95) agrees with Poppe's opinion: "z- Formen aus irgendwelchem z-Dialekt". At present there are two Turkic languages in which there is a -z- in the place of Old Turkic -d-, these are Khakass and Yellow Uighur but for historical and geographical reasons both are out of the question.

The standard Kipchak form of Old Turkic edgü exists in the VK languages as well, Cf. Tat. igelek, Bashk. igelek 'good'. They underwent the development edgülik > eygilik > igelek and their stem ⁺eygi > ⁺ige would be the regular and expected form.

The Turkic literary languages played an important role in the life of the Volga Turkic peoples. From among the three phases of Eastern (East) Turkic languages, the Kharakhanide, the Khwarezmian and the Chagatay, the second and the third can be detected in the Volga-district where they were soon influenced by the local languages. That means that local versions developed which were later considerably influenced by Osman Turkish as well. In eastern literary Turkic we can actually find the form in question: Kāšğarī: eḍgü, Kutadgu Bilig: eḍgü, Yugnaki: eḍgü, Rabḡūzī: eḍgü, ezgü, Nahčul al-Farādīs: eḍgü, Husrav and Šīrīn: eḍgü, Tefsīr: eḍgü, ezgü, eygü, At-tuhfat: eḍgü, Ibn Muḥanna: eḍgü, (Turkmān) eygü ("in our country"), Chagatay: edgü, eḍgü, ezgü, Qisay Yusuf: eḍgü, eygü.

It is obvious that the possibility of a literary borrowing did exist. The word occurs, however, in Chuvash as well. In modern Chuvash we come across the word ira indicating 'good ghost, good', which Egorov (1964, p.344) rightly associated with the Old Turkic word edgü. The Chuvash -r- developed through -z- (Cf. adaq 'foot' Chuvash ura), the -g- regularly dropped out and the present form came into being from the original edgü through a previous form [†]irě[†]ezgi.

The VK ezgi could be both a literary adoption and a borrowing from the Volga Bulgarian language. Now let us examine two other words belonging also to religious terminology.

Tat. böti, Tat. dialect bötü 'amulet, talisman', Tat. Paasonen bätü 'Geschriebenes Gebet das am Hals getragen wird', Bashk: beteü 'amulet, talisman'. The word occurs in Chuvash too: pětü (in Viryal there is no ö!) 'amulet' The Chuvash word is the equivalent of the Old Turkic bitig 'writing'. In Chuvash it is a regular development bitig > [†]bitiḡ > [†]bitiü > [†]bětěü > pětü (declination stem pětěvě). As we can see, Bashkir has retained the last but one Chuvash form. The semantic development from the denotation 'writing' to 'amulet' can be fairly understood from Paasonen's data. It should be noted that in a Tatar dialect there happens to be also a word

betek 'talisman' while the form 'writing' in every Tatar dialect is beteg. The labial vowel of the first syllable of the Tatar data is secondary in all cases¹.

Tatar: täre 'krest', Tat. dialect: täre tamga 'rodinka' Tat. Radlov: tări 'ikona, obraz', Bashk: täre 'krest, ikona, obraz'. The word is of the same origin as Tatar tānri 'god' which is a very old inheritance in Tatar. In täre we cannot explain the dropping of the -ŋ- from Tatar itself. In Chuvash we can find the form tură, dial. türě. This goes back to an earlier ⁺tūri < ⁺teūri < ⁺tegri < tenri. Tatar borrowed the form teūri and the long ā recorded by Radlov; reflects an eū or perhaps even an ey sound-combination.

These two words have undoubtedly come to the VK languages from Bulgar-Turkic and therefore it is quite likely that Tat. izge may belong to them.

As to the chronology of the borrowing we can state that according to Russian sources the z > r change had already taken place at the beginning of the 13th century, and it is reflected by the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions from the 13th century on. The borrowing must have taken place before the end of the 12th century, i.e. before the Mongol period. The above words could theoretically have been borrowed between the 9th and the 13th centuries, because in the loan-words dating from before the Hungarian

Conquest - - at least in certain phonetical situations - - the -z- sound (Cf. túzok, búza) had already appeared. At this time the Volga Bulgarian empire was in its glory.

From all this we can conclude that Turkic--Kipchak contacts in the middle Volga-region began earlier than the Mongolian era.

Notes

- 1 There are two possible explanations for the labial vowel of the first syllable. There is a word bütek 'little idol' in Osman Turkish (Redhouse) which is the originally Persian büt with a diminutive suffix. (About the latter, see G. Doerfer I, pp.261-262). If the Tat. böti, bötü were connected with this word then the disappearance of the final -k- could be explained only by a Bulgar-Turkic transmission. That is highly improbable for the simple reason that the voicing of the -k- in Bulgar-Turkic is very early. It is, however, not impossible that the influence of the basic word büt, frequent in Turkic might have strengthened a labilization that could have appeared as an effected of initial b-. Paasonen's data and the Baskhir equivalent makes the relationship of the Tatar -ö- and -e- forms obvious. At the same time, the fact that there is no reduced labial sound in the Viryal dialect of the Chuvash language precludes the existence of an original labial sound in the first syllable.

PROTO-PERMIAN AND VOTYAK LOAN-WORDS
IN CHUVASH⁺

by

K. RÉDEI and A. RÓNA-TAS

The Bulgar-Turkic, or Chuvash loans in the Permian languages fall into three groups: a/ loan-words taken from Middle Bulgarian (= MB) in the Proto-Permian period (20-22 words); b/ MB loan-words in the Permyak (= P) dialect of Syryan borrowed through Votyak mediation (9 words); c/ Chuvash loan-words in Votyak. These words, according to Wichmann (1903) amount to about 130, but the actual number of the Chuvash elements in Votyak is considerably larger. On the first two groups of loan-words see Rédei--Róna-Tas (1972, 1975). An up-to-date study of the Chuvash elements in Votyak is still to be done.

Both Chuvash and the Permian languages borrowed words from each other, although the Chuvash loans in Votyak outnumber the Votyak ones in the former. Some words (?3, 12, 20) were taken from PP as early as the MB period. After the splitting up of the Permian languages Chuvash took loan-words only from Votyak. We cannot reckon with Syryan → Chuvash borrowings both because of their distant geographical location and for historical reasons. The number of Permian loan-words in Chuvash

⁺ First published in Hungarian: Őspermi és votják jövevényszavak a csuvasban: NyK 82 (1980). pp. 125-133.

amounts to 16 certain and 6 uncertain etymologies. The relatively large number of uncertain etymologies is due to the fact that in four cases the possibility of Cheremis → Chuvash, and in one case Proto-Hungarian → Chuvash borrowings cannot be excluded. In one case (21) the etymology of the Chuvash word is uncertain for other reasons.

Word-list

1. Chuv. (Ahlqvist) an 'nicht (Verneinungswort im Imperativ)', (Ałmarin) an 'particula negativa fennica, quae additur imperativo': urây an turt 'bol'še ne kuri', (Egorov), an kala 'ne govori', an sir 'ne piši'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. K en 'ne; nicht (the imperative of the negative verb)~(Syr. en, in).^x

Ramstedt (1952, p.83 and see also Poppe 1974, p.146) derives this word from the second person imperative form ending in -n of the "Altaic" (in fact, Mongolian--Manchu--Tungus) negative copulative verb e-. Kononov (1967, p. 107) explains the word from a gerundial form ending in -n of the copulative verb e-. Ramstedt's, Poppe's and Kononov's opinions can hardly be accepted, as the negative copulative verb e- has no other traces in the Turkic

^x Abbreviations which are not explained at the end of this volume can be found in MSzFE I, pp. 47-68 and III, pp. 707-727.

languages. On the other hand, there is a structural-morphological parallel between the Chuvash and Permian data, which cannot be only by coincidence.

The Votyak phoneme e is very often an open ɛ (Munk. ä) phonetically in the initial position. On this phenomenon see E. Itkonen 1954, p. 304. The ɛ allophone of the Votyak phoneme e changed to a in Chuvash.

The Tat. anšarla 'schweigel!' was taken from Chuvash: an šarla 'muck dich nicht!' (Räsänen, 1969, p. 20).

Ašmarin 1898, p. 297, 317; Wichmann, 1903, p. 148; Egorov 1964, p. 26.

2. Chuv. (Ašmarin IV, p. 78, V, p. 336, XVI, p. 371) ätär, Viryal ötör 'vodjanaja krysa?', vätär, Viryal vötör 'nazv. životnogo (pomen'še krysy, s korotkim hvostom)', jätär 'vydra', (Paasonen 1908), štär 'pézs-más patkány; Bisamratte, Bisamspitzmaus', (Egorov 1964, Sirotkin 1961) ätär, vätär 'vodjanaja krysa, rečnaja vydra'.

←? Voty. (Wied.) udor 'Biber (Castor)', (Munk.) Sz. K vudor 'vidra; Fischotter, Flussotter' ~ (Syr. vurd 'Fischotter').

The Permian words may be loans from Middle Iranian, the Voty. udor, vudor derive from an Iranian form containing the combination -dr- (Cf. Avestan udrō, Pehlevi udrag, Old Indian udrah 'Otter, Fischotter'), and the

Syr. vurd derives from the Iranian form with an -rd- combination (Cf. Ossetic ŭrd, urda 'id.', Joki 1973, p. 347). According to the ESK, the Votyak word goes back to PP ^xvurd, and the recent forms vudor, udor are results of folk-etymology (Cf. vu-dor, vu-dur 'bank, riverside'). The word there occurs also in Cheremis (Ramst.) KHġdġr 'Maulwurf', (PS) B udġr 'Wühlmaus'. The Cheremis word can also be an Iranian loan, but its Baltic origin cannot be excluded either. Cf. Lithuanian ŭdra, ŭdras, Lettish ŭdr/i/s and Old Prussian udro 'Fischotter' (see Joki 1973, p. 348).

The Votyak -d- was substituted by the Chuvash -t- (= ḍ). Chuvash borrowed the Voty. udor as ġtġr, and the Voty. vudor as vġtġr. The initial v- of the Chuvash form vġtġr may have arisen under the influence of the Russian vydra 'Otter, Fischotter'. However, it is also possible that the Chuvash forms are loans from Cheremis. On principle, the v- can be of Chuvash origin: Votyak or. Cheremis → Chuv. ^xudra > vġtġr. As no word there exists in the other Turkic languages similar in form and meaning to the Chuv. ġtġr, vġtġr, Egorov (1964, p. 44) considers it of Indo-European origin. However, it is hardly possible that the word was borrowed from an Indo-European language directly.

Räsänen 1920, p. 234 (Chuv. ← Cher.); Egorov

1964, p. 44 (← IE).

3. Chuv. (Ašmarin VII, p. 222) kâšmi 'brjukva, bušma' ($< \text{MB } ^x\text{yŭšmi}$).

← ? PP $^x\text{kožm}_3$ Svr. (Wied.) P komiž 'Lauch (Allium)', (Lytk.) Ja. ku'mić 'pero luka, zelenyj luk', Voty. (Wied.) kumuž, kumiz 'Knoblauch', (Munk.) Sz. kumiz (!) 'id.', (URSl.) kumiz 'dikij česnok'.

The recent Permian forms have arisen from PP $^x\text{kožm}_3$ ($> ^x\text{kožim}$) by the way of metathesis. In case the Chuv. kâšmi would be a loan from Permian, it could have only be borrowed from PP in the MB period, at which time the metathesis did not take place in the Permian words. The PP sound ž appears as š in MB (Cf. also 12 and 16). In the case that this word would be a loan from Ancient Hungarian, we would have to reckon with the same possibility. Namely, the MB $^x\text{yŭšmi}$ may be an Ancient Hungarian loan $^x\text{kožm}_3$ < Ugric $^x\text{kočm}_3$ or kačm_3). On the Hungarian word see MSzFE (under hagyma, on the etymology of the Chuvash word see Rédei--Róna-Tas 1975, p. 32, 1976, p. 142.

4. Chuv. (Ahlqvist) kigen 'Nieswurz; Čeremica', (Ašmarin VI, p. 197, 199) kiken, kikken 'Čeremica belaja', (Paasonen 1908) kiken 'hunyor, Nieswurz; Čeremica'.

← Voty. (Wichmann 1903, p. 148) G kekon, J kekon-turim kekon-viži 'Nieswurm; veratrum' ~ (Syr. P. koka'n 'id.').

The word was taken from Chuvash by Cheremis:
(Ramst.) KH kikān 'die weisse Nieswurzh', (PS) B keken
'Nieswurzh'.

Wichmann 1903, p.148; (Voty. → Chuv., Chuv.
→ Cher.); Gombocz 1912, p.101; Räsänen 1923, p.85
(Chuv. → Cher.), 1969, p.248; Egorov 1964, p.112;
Fedotov 1968, p.201.

5. Chuv. (Ašmarin) kətmel 'brysnika, černik'
kətməl 'kljukva' (Paasonen 1908) kətmel 'vörös áfonya;
Preiselbeere'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. kudi-mulⁱ 'a fekete áfonya
bogyója; Heidelbeere (als Frucht)', (Wichm.) G kud^r-mul^r
'Heidelbeere, Blaubeere'.

The Votyak -d- was substituted by -t- in Chuvash.

The Bashk. kürtmäli 'Preiselbeere' can also be a
loan from Votyak.

Wichmann 1903, p.149; Ašmarin VII, p.321; Fedotov
1968, p.201.

6. Chuv. (Ašmarin VIII, pp.22, 23, 25, 34, 35, 36,
37, 38, 110) lap 'loščina, ložbina, nizkoe mesto, nizmen-
nost', ravnina', lapa 'nizkoe mesto, nizmennost'', lap^ə
'nizmennost', ložbina, loščina', laptak 'ploskij', lapt^{ək}
'ploskij; plašmja', lapša 'ploskij, nizkij', lapšaka
'ploskij', lăp 'nizina, loščina', (Paasonen 1908) lap 'sík',
sík hely, róna; Ebene, flache Stelle', lap-săr 'id.'.

← Voty. (Munk.) K lap 'alacsony; niedrig', (Wichmann 1907, p.42) MU lap: lap inti 'Niederung, niedrige Fläche' (inti 'Platz, Stelle').

According to Räsänen (1920, p.249) the Chuvash word is a loan from Cheremis (Cf. Cher. lap 'niedrig; Niederung'). The Chuv. (Ašmarin) lapčăk 'platt, gedrückt (z.B. Nase)' is, no doubt, of Cheremis origin Cf. Cher. J lapcaka, U lapčaka 'platt, dünn und breit' (Wichmann 1907, p.42). Some of the derivatives seem to be Chuvash forms. The Bashk. lapak 'nizkij' is a loan from Votyak, Cf. (Munk.) Sz. lapeg, K lapek 'alacsony kis növést, törpe; niedrig, klenwüchsig'. The word there occurs in Tatar as well and, perhaps, is a loan from Votyak: lap 'rovnyj', lăp-lăpăg 'nizkij, napr. o nečennom hlebě', lăpšek 'kurnosyj'.

Munkácsi 1887-90a, p.122 (Cher. → Chuv.); Wichmann 1903, p.149 (Voty. → Chuv.); Räsänen 1920, p.249 (Cher. → Chuv.); Egorov 1964, p.125; MSzFE (under lap: Voty. or Cher. → Chuv., Voty. → Bashk.); Fedotov 1968, p.202.

7. Chuv. (Ašmarin VIII, p.75) lenkes 'nazv. dolbljonoj derevjannoj posudy', (Paasonen 1908) lenges 'kis veder; Eimerchen'.

← Voty. (Wied.) lănges, lănes, lănes 'Gefäss, kleiner Eimer', (Munk.) Sz. lănez 'vizhordó kártus nyír-

héjból; Wasserbüttel aus Birkenrinde'~(Syr. SSKD Lu. Le. lānes 'podojnik').

We can consider the Voty. lānges, lānes or lānez as a lending form. Both the Voty. -s, and -z are substituted by -s in Chuvash.

The word got into Tatar: lāngāz, lāngās, lāngēz 'Eimerchen' and into Russian: ljangās 'dolgiy burak, vysokij tues'. The Mishar əlāngāč 'Eimerchen' may be a loan from Cheremis because of its final -č, Cf. Cher. (Ramst.) KH lāngəš 'Eimer aus einem ausgehöhlten Baumstamme', (PS) B lenəš 'ausgehöhlte hohe Bütte'.

Räsänen 1920, p.252 (Cher. → Chuv.); 1969, p. 316; Fedotov 1968, p.203; ESK.

8. Chuv. (Ašmarin VIII, p.124) lās 'razvesistye vetvi dereva; razvesistyj, kudrjavyj; hvoja, igly'. (Paasonen 1908) lās 'bojtos, sūrđ, dūslobu; buschig, dicht, dicht belaubt'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. lis, K les 'tűlevél; Nadelblatt, Tangel', (Wichm.) G līs, MU lis 'id.'~(Syr. lis 'id.')

The etymologically corresponding form to these Permian words occurs in Cheremis as well: (Wichm.) U lūs, M lūjūs 'Tangel, Nadel (U), Tannen- od. Fichttenzweig (M), (PS) B lūjēs 'Nadel od. Stachel des Nadelbaums' (see ESK). The Chuv. lās cannot be

a borrowing of the Cheremis word because of its sound â.

The Votyak word got into Tatar and Bashkir in the form ilis.

Fedotov 1968, p.203.

9. Chuv. (Ašmarin VIII, p.163) majak 'veha, veška', (Paasonen 1908) majak 'útmutató(fa); Wegzeichen'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. M majig, K majek, majik 'rúd; sövénykaró; útmutató oszlop; jelező pózna; Stange, Pfahl; Zaunpfahl; Wegweiser (Pfahl, Säule); Stange, die als Zeichen irgendwo aufgestellt ist', (Wichmann 1903, p. 86) G UF. majeg, J M majig, MU majik 'Pfahl, Stange, Spiess' (Syr. majeg 'Stange, Pfahl, Zaunpfahl').

In case the Chuvash word does not originate from a majik, majek and majik, but a majeg or majig form, we have to reckon with a -g>-k sound-substitution.

The Chuvash sound a, occurring in the second syllable may have been influenced by the Russian majak 'Feuerbake, Leuchtturm'.

The word can be found as a loan from Votyak in Tatar: majak 'Wegweiser (Pfahl, Säule)' and in Bashkir: majak 'Stange (als Zeichen)'. The Syr. majeg, Voty. majig, etc. are Iranian loan-words, Cf. Joki 1973, p.279.

Wichmann 1903, p.86 (Syr.-Voty. ←? Chuv.); Rédei-Róna-Tas 1975, p.40 (The authors reject the idea of originating the Permian words from Chuvash).

10. Chuv. (Ašmarin IX, p.27) nimər, mimər 'zavariha', (Paasonen 1908) nimər 'lisztből és vajból készített kása; von Mehl und Butter bereite Grütze'.

← Voty. (Wichmann 1903, p.89) MU ńemri (^xńemeri or ^xńemiri): barangi-ńemri 'Kertoffelsuppe' (barangi 'Kartoffel').

In the Chuvash form mimər an n>m assimilation took place under the influence of the Inlaut -m-. The word was borrowed preceeding the time of the Chuvash ^xe>i sound-change, so it belongs to a relatively earlier layer.

The Chuvash word might be the adoption of the Cher. (Ramst.) KH ńemər 'Gerstengrütze', (PS) B ńemer 'Hafer- od. Erbsengrütze, die mit Butter gegessen wird'. The Cheremis word is a loan from Votyak.

Wichmann 1903, p.89 (Chuv. → Cher., Voty.); Räsänen 1920, p.256 (Chuv. = Cher.); Bereczki 1977, p.71 (Voty. → Cher. → Chuv.); Egorov 1964, p.140; Fedotov 1968, p.205.

11. Chuv. (Ašmarin VIII, p.325, X, p.181) məši 'olen'', pəši 'los', olén''.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. pužej, pužej 'rénszarvas; Rentier', (Wichmann 1903, p.150) Uf. G M J MU pužej 'id.', M kir-pužej 'Elentier' ~ (Syr. I pež: pež-ku 'Haut

des Rentierkalbes').

The sound š corresponds in Chuvash to the Votyak ž. If the Chuvash word is an adoption of the Voty. pužej, it is possible that the Votyak sound ž was substituted by the sound š, in Chuvash final -i is a regular development of an earlier -ey (Cf. Róna-Tas 1966, p. 332) and refers to a relatively early borrowing.

Besides Chuvash the Votyak word got into other Turkic languages as well: Tat. pyšy 'Hirsch, Wild; pušy, pöšöj, Bashk. myšy, Tobol Tatar miši. Of these words the Tobol Tatar miši cannot have been borrowed directly from Votyak but through Tatar or Bashkir mediation. The Russian pyž 'molodoj olen'', pyžik 'Rentierkalb' may be loans from Votyak or Tatar.

Paasonen 1902b, Note 107; Wichmann 1903, p. 151; Egorov 1964, p. 152; Räsänen 1969, p. 385; Fedotov 1968, p. 205.

12. Chuv. (Ašmarin IX, p. 209) pileš 'rjabina', (Paasonen 1908) pileš 'piros berkenye, madárberkenye; Vogelbeere'.

← PP ^xpelij or ^xpeliz Syr. (WUo.) V AV Sz. Pecs. Lu. Le. pelis, I peliz 'Vogelbeere'. Voty. (Munk.) Sz. paleš, K palež 'vörös berkenye, barkóca; Vogelbeere, Spierlingsbeere, Eberesche' (Wichmann 1903, p. 90) Uf. pales, palež, G J palez, J M páwez 'Vogelbeere'.

Though the Chuvash š correspondence of the PP or Votyak palatalized affricate (š, ṣ̌ and ṣ̣̌) needs further investigation, the parallel data support each other and make these etymologies undoubtedly correct (Cf. nos 3 and 16).

The Permian words, opposing to Wichmann (1903, p. 90) are not loans from Chuvash, but of Finno-Ugric origin (Toivonen 1928, p.202, FUV, SKES, ESK, etc., see also Rédei--Róna-Tas 1975, p.41).

Because of its first-syllabic i, the Chuv. piles cannot originate from the Voty. paleẓ, but it can be explained from its PP proto-form. The fact, that the word is widespread among the Turkic languages (Tat. milāṣ̣̌, Bashk. milāṣ̣̌, Trkm. meleş̣̣, etc. 'Vogelbeere') supports the supposition that the word was borrowed at an early date. The Tobol Tatar micār and the Bashk. myšar 'Eberesche' are loans from Ob-Ugric languages, Cf. Vogul (WV 27) TJ picār, AK pāsār, Szo. pašar 'Ebereschenbeere', Ostyak (OL 182) Vj. pətər, DN pətār 'id.' (see SKES under pihlaja).

Wichmann 1903, p. 90; Egorov 1964, p.160, Räsänen 1969, p. 338.

13. Chuv. (Ašmarin X, p.166, 167) pāčārt- 'sžat'', pāčārta- 'davit, sžimat''.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. pižirt-, J pizirt- 'kifacsarni,

kicsavarni (pl. a ruhát); kiszorítani, kinyomni (pl. a gyümölcsnek a levét); ausringen, auswinden (z.B. die Wäsche); ausdrücken, auspressen (z.B. den Saft von Früchten)', (Wichmann 1903, p.150) Uf. přzřrt-, MU J M pižirt- 'ausdrücken, auspressen'~(Syr. pižirt- 'id.').

The Voty. $\frac{3}{8} \rightarrow$ Chuv. $\frac{3}{8}$ sound-substitution -- that is different from the Votyak $\frac{3}{8}$, $\frac{3}{8}$ and $\frac{3}{8}$ Chuvash $\frac{3}{8}$ correspondence occurring in etymologies nos 3, 12 and 16 -- refers to the fact that here we have to reckon with a later borrowing. Egorov (1964, p.151) originates the word from an onomapoeic stem păčăr; still this Chuvash onomapoeic word seems to be a back-formation from the verb (Cf. păčăr 'podr. zvuku, polučajuščemujsja pri vyžimanii židkosti' Ašmarin X, p.165). The word has also a dialectal form păzârda (Ašmarin X, p.167), but this form is probably used only by Cheremis-Chuvash bilingual speakers.

The Votyak word got into Cheremis as well: (Wichm.) KH păzare-, păzart -.U păzâre-, M pižare- 'zudrücken, zusammendrücken, pressen' (Bereczki 1977, p.64).

According to Bereczki (loc. cit.) the Chuvash word is a loan from Cheremis. This opinion, however, because of the Chuvash $\frac{3}{8}$ Cheremis $\frac{3}{8}$, $\frac{3}{8}$ sound-correspondence, is hardly plausible.

Wichmann 1903, p.150; MSzFE (under facsar):

Egorov 1964, p.151.

14. Chuv. (Ašmarin IX, p.256) pukan, Viryal pokan 'žurban, obrubok dereva; stul, taburetkā; skameečka, kotoraja stavitsja pod nogi (tak u mnogih); girja (u vesov i časov); krjuk u dverej; motok' (Paasonen 1908) pukan 'fatuskó (melyen ülnek); Klotz (zum Sitzen)',

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. K pukon 'szék, ülés, ülőhely; Stuhl, Sitz', (Wichmann 1903, p.150) G M J MU Uf. pukon 'Stuhl' (Cf. Syr. pukal-, Voty. puk- 'sitzen').

The word there occurs in Cheremis as a loan from Votyak (Bereczki 1977, p.72) P B MK U CŰ pŭken, CK pökön, ČN pöken, etc. 'Stuhl'. The Chuv. pögön, pögen, pöken (Ašmarin 1898, p.349) are loans from Cheremis. These data represent the dialect of Malo-Karačkino, which has strongly been influenced by Cheremis.

The Votyak word got into both Tatar (bŭkän 'Klotz, Holzblock, Sitz, Stuhl') and Bashkir (bŭkär 'id.').

Wichmann 1903, p.150; Räsänen 1969, p.92; Egorov 1964, p.163.

15. Chuv. (Ašmarin X, p.233) pärne 'kuzov', (Ašmarin II, p.42) 'kovš, t. e. jaščik, v kotoryj nasypaetsja zerno dlja razmola ili dlja obdiranija', pärme 'pletenska, korzina, kuzov', (Paasonen 1908) pärne 'kosárka; Körbchen', pärme 'garatfiók, garateregető; Mühltrichter'.

← Voty. (Wichmann 1903, p.148) Uf. M J berno

'Braukufe (Uf.), Mühltrichter (M I)', ~ (Syr. V Sz. I burna
'Tschetwerik (ein Getreidemass) (V); grosses, rundes
Gefäss aus einem Stück Espenholz, bes. zum Schütten des
Getreides od. auch zum Aufbewahren von allerlei Sachen
(nicht als Mass) (Sz.); Brunnen (I)').

The Votyak initial b- was substituted by p- in Chuvash.
The Votyak rn' sound-combination corresponds partly to rn
= [rn'], partly to rm in Chuvash.

The Cher. (Wichm.) J JU pūrna 'Korb aus Linden- od.
Birkenrinde' is a loan from Proto-Permian or Votyak.
(Bereczki 1977, p. 64).

Wichmann 1903, p. 148 (Voty. → Chuv.); Räsänen
1920, p. 258 (Cher. → Chuv.); Egorov 1964, p. 157 (Voty.
or Cher. → Chuv.); ESK (Permian → Chuv.); Fedotov
1968, p. 205.

16. Chuv. (Ašmarin X, p. 232) pəraš, Viryal pöröš
'orudie v rode pešni, no s bolee širokim koncom'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. piriča, M piriča 'vájó, véső,
a teknő v. méhkas kivájásánál alkalmazott szerszám;
Hohleisen (zum Aushöhlen eines Troges od. Rienenstockes
gebrauchtes Werkzeug)', (Wichmann 1903, p. 91) J pirič
'Brecheisen, Brechstange' (Syr. V AV Pecs. piriž Sz. Ud.
piriž 'lange Brechstange, Eishaue (die Spitze aus Eisen,
der Schaft aus Holz)').

On the Votyak č Chuvash š correspondence see the

etymologies nos 1, 3 and 12.

The form piric[↓], or perhaps the hypothetical form ^xpiric[↓] can be considered as the Votyak lending form for the Chuvash word. From Votyak the word also got into Tatar: böröš 'Stemmeisen mit langem Stiel, zum Aushöhlen der Bienenstöcke' and into Bashkir: böröz 'id.'. The Votyak i Turkic ö correspondence can be due to its occurrence after the sound b.

Wichmann 1903, p. 91 (Chuv. → Syr. - Voty.);
Räsänen 1969, p. 387 (Chuv., Tat., Bashk. = Syr., Voty.);
Rédei--Róna-Tas 1975, p. 41 (loan from a Finno-Ugric language).

17. Chuv. (Ašmarin XI, p. 104, 124, 125, 233) sij 'struja, sloj zemli', sija 'plenka, kožura na dereve', si, sij, sâj 'sloj', (Paasonen 1908) si, si 'évgyűrd (fán); Jahresring an einem Baum'.

←Voty. (Wichmann 1914, p. 102) J si 'Jahresring an Bäumen', (URS1) si 'sloj' (Syr. FV FSz. Lu. Le. Şzkr. Ud. si 'volokno').

The Chuvash forms sij and sij can originate from Votyak only in case the Votyak word still had the assumed ^xsij < ^xsij proto-form at the time of the borrowing.

The etymological correspondences of the Permian words there occur in Cheremis as well: (Wichm.) KH sâj, sâja, U sija 'Jahresring an Bäumen (KH U), Fleisch -

schicht, Fleischfaser (KH)', (Tr.) ši 'Baumschicht' (see SKES under sy). For this reason, the possibility that the Chuvash forms sij, si, sij and sâj had been borrowed from Cheremis preceeding the time that the Cheremis s>š sound-change took place, cannot be excluded. The Chuvash word šâj 'sloj, volokno' (Egorov 1964) is rather unreliable, as it cannot be found neither in Ašmarin's, nor in Sirotkin's dictionaries. If there exists such a word at all, in all probability, it must originate from a Cher. šâj (<^x sâj) form. (The Chuv. si>ši>^š development, of chronological considerations, must be excluded.)

The Tat. zyj 'sloj, volokno' (Zolotnickij 1875) must be a loan from Votyak.

Räsänen 1920, p.260 (Cher. → Chuv.), 1969, p.420; Egorov 1964, p.190; SKES; Fedotov 1968, p. 206.

18. Chuv. (Ašmarin XII, p.63) šarâk 'repa', (Paasonen 1908) šarâk 'répa; Rûbe'.

← Voty. ^xšarik, ^xšarik, Cf. (Munk.) Sz. šartči, K čarče 'répa; Rûbe', (Wichmann 1903, p.97) G Uf. šarcŷ, M. MU šarči, J šartči 'id.' (Syr. V Ud. šorkni, V. Pecs. Le. I šortni, Sz. Lu. P šortni 'id.').

The Chuvash word, which has no cognates in the Turkic languages, can be well explained from a Votyak ^xšarik or ^xšarik forms. The present-day Votyak words carry the denominal nomen suffix -či. We have to reckon

with a Votyak ^xśarikci > śarkci > śartci > śarči, and a Syryan ^xśorikni > śorkni > śortni > śortni development. On the Syryan o Votyak a sound-correspondence Cf. E. Itkonen 1954; p. 320.

Wichmann 1903, p. 97 (Chuv. → Syr., Voty.); Rédei --Róna-Tas 1975, p. 42 (the Permian words are not loans from Chuvash).

19. Chuv. (Ašmarin XII, pp. 79, 80) śem 'melodija, motiv; garmonija, podhodnost', to, čto pod silu', śemə 'motiv, melodija, garmonija, stroj, lad; porjadok, sposob, sootvetsvie', śemən 'po mere togo, kak'.

← Voty. (Munk.) Sz. śam 'szokás, tulajdonság; mód, természet, minőség; Sitte, Gewohnheit, Eigenschaft; Art, Natur, Beschaffenheit', (Wichmann 1903, p. 151) G J śam 'Sitte, Gewohnheit, Art, Charakter, Temperament', (Munk.) Sz. śamen 'szerint, módjára, hasonlóan mint; gemäß, so wie...', (Wichmann, loc. cit) G śamen, sam̃m, MU śamen 'während, unterdessen, als'~(Syr. śam 'Verstehen, Fähigkeit, Geschicklichkeit, Charakter').

According to Levitskaja (1976, p. 10) the Chuvash postposition śemən is, in fact, the word śemə carrying the Turkic instrumental suffix -n. This view can hardly be plausible, as the Chuvash form śemən cannot be separated from the lending Votyak postposition śamən. The Chuvash form -śem 'po mere togo, kak' (Ašmarin XII,

p. 79) has become a suffix and lost the -n instrumental case-ending.

The Cher. śem 'Melodie, Ton', śemān 'gemäss', semān 'während' (Räsänen 1920, p. 190) are loans from Chuvash (Räsänen, loc. cit.).

Paasonen 1902a, p. 266; Wichmann 1903, p. 151 (Voty. → Chuv.); Egorov 1964, p. 209.

20. Chuv. (Ašmarin XII, p. 270) śurēm, Viryal śorēm 'pučok l'na, konopli, snop l'nu', (Paasonen 1908) śurēm 'két hánccsal összekötött kender- vagy lenköteg; zwei Bündel Flachs od. Hanf mit Bast zusammengebunden'.

← PP ^xśorēm > Syr. (SSKD) Lu. Pecs. Szkr. KSz. śorem, FV śorem, Le. śorom 'skird, skirda, dolgaja klad' hleba' (see Voty. Munk. Sz. śur-, K śur- (asztagot v. boglyát/rakni, hányni; (Schober) errichten, machen', URSI, śuri- 'skirdovat').

The Chuvash word can be a PP loan-word. Concluding from the Syr. śorem and the Votyak verbal form śuri-, we could consider a Votyak derivation ^xśurem, but no such word occurs in the relevant dictionaries. It would also be difficult to explain phonetically the Chuv. śurēm from an assumed Votyak derivation ^xśurem, since - according to the rare relevant examples - the sounds ê or ə correspond to the Votyak u in the Votyak loan-words in the Chuvash language. (Cf. the etymologies nos 2, 5 and

11; however, in the Votyak u).

The Votyak word got into some Russian dialects as well: šorómy 'sostavlennye v kozly žerdi dlja prosuški v pole goroha v kitinah', šorom 'skidra hleba' (ESK) -- It is possible that the Russian word is a loan from Chuvash.

The Syr. (SSKD) FSz. šorom 'skird, skirda', (WUo.) P šoro 'm' 'Getreidehaufen, Getreideschober' is a re-borrowing from Russian.

21. Chuv. (Ašmarin XIV, pp. 230, 331, XV, p. 13) târšă, târšăi, tûršăi, tăššă 'obuh', (Paasonen 1908) târšă 'fejszefok, késfok; der Rücken einer Axt od. eines Messers' (Zolotnickij 1875) ? tuš 'Rücken v. Axt od. Messer'.

← Voty. (Munk.) tiš (tišk-): purt-tiš 'késfoka; Messerrücken', (Wichmann 1903, p. 152) J tiš (tišk-) 'Rücken v. Messer od. Axt' ~ (Syr. tiš (tišk-) 'Rücken der Axt od. des Messers').

The sound r in the Chuvash form târšă can be secondary in the position before the sound š. (On this problem Cf. Bereczki 1977, p. 66).

It cannot be excluded that the Chuv. târšă, tăššă might belong to the following words: tûrt, Viryal tört 'spina; oborotnaja, tyl'naja storona predmeta' (Ašmarin XIV, p. 228) and tûrtăš 'tylovaja storona; obuh' (op. cit., p. 229). If it is so, the suffixes -š, -ă and -ăi are, in fact, the ancient third person possessive suffixes, which have sur-

vived only in kinship terms and some expressions. However, the problem is even more complicated, as the Chuv. türt has no clear etymology. It is also possible that we have to reckon with a convergent development of two words - a genuine Chuvash word and a Votyak loan. In the case that the word originates from Votyak, the above-mentioned third person possessive suffix could have influenced the development of the word-ending.

The Chuvash form tuš^ʋ - if this is a correct recording at all - can be the adoption of Cher. (Wichm.) KH U toš^ʋ 'Rücken des Messers, der Axt, der Sense usw.'.

Wichmann 1903, p.152; Egorov 1964, p.239.

22. Chuv. (Ašmarin V, pp.197, 288) vij, věj 'sila, sredstva', (Paasonen 1908) věj 'erő; Kraft, Stärke'.

←? Voty. (Munk.) vi (vij-): Sz. kat-vi 'erő, tehetőség; Kraft, Vermögen', Sz. M joz-vi 'a test tagjai (összességükben értve); die Glieder des Körpers (in ihrer Gesamtheit)'~(Syr. vij, vi: Sz. jez-vij 'Gliedgelenk', V jez-vi 'Sehne, Fleischse'). On the meanings 'Kraft, Vermögen' and 'die Glieder des Körpers' in Votyak see SKES; MSzFE (under -val/-vel) etc.

It is possible, that the Chuv. věj is a loan from Cheremis, Cf. (Wichm.) KH U wi, M B wij 'Kraft' (Räsänen 1920, p.273). Anyway, originating the word from Votyak or Cheremis is weakened by the fact that

the word can belong to the native word-stock of the Chuvash language: ^xuj Old Turkic, Uighur u- 'können'; ^xuj-uy (Räsänen 1969, p. 510). In this case we would expect a form ^xvâj, such form, however, cannot be found in Ašmarin. The words with labial vowels in Ašmarin (V, p. 261) vuj and voj 'sila' cannot originate from Votyak. It is possible, that the Chuv. vij and vâj are of Votyak or Cheremis origin, and the form vuj and voj are independent words from the former.

Wichmann 1903, p. 153; Egorov 1964, p. 48; Fedotov 1968, p. 198.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY TOWARDS A FUTURE ETYMOLOGICAL
DICTIONARY OF CHUVASH

compiled by
ÁDÁM MOLNÁR

- AALTO, P. (1965), Review on Beševliev 1963: Linguistics. The Hague-Paris 14, 105-106.
- AALTO, P. (1969), Uralisch und Altaisch: UAJb 41, 323-334.
- AALTO, P. (1970), Review on Krueger 1968: Linguistics. The Hague-Paris 60, 116-117.
- AALTO, P. (1971), Iranian Contacts of the Turks in Pre-Islamic Times: Studia Turcica, BOH XVII. Ed by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 29-37.
- ABAEV, V. I. (1958-79), Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' ossetinskogo jazyka I-III. Leningrad.
- ABŪ HAYYĀN, Kitāb al-Idrāk li-lisān al-Atrāk. Ed. by A. Cafer-oğlu. Istanbul 1931.
- AFANAS'EV, P. S. -- M. S. VORONKIN -- M. P. ALEKSEEV (1976), Dialektologičeskij slovar' jakutskogo jazyka. Moskva 1976.
- AHATOV, G. H. (1963), Dialekt zapadosibirskih tatar. Ufa.
- AHMAROV, G. (1908), Bulgar tarihi. Kazan'.
- ALMAZOV, A. (1804), Bukvar' s sokraščennym katehizisom na rossijskom i čuvašskom jazykah. Moskva.
- ANANINA, A. I. (1974), Udarenie v verhne-alatyrskih govoraх mokšanskogo jazyka: SFu 10, 11.13.
- ANDREEV, N. A. (1956), Čuvašskie projadkovye čislitel'nye v sravnenii s porjadkovym čislitel'nymi bulgarskih namogil'nyh nadpisej: UZČ 14, 236-245.
- ANDREEV, N. A. (1961), Čuvašsko-russkij slovar'. Moskva.
- ARNIM, von B. (1956), Urbulgarisch *καλνυρ ~ κουλούβρος*; Festschrift Vasmer. Berlin, 45-46.
- AŠM. see AŠMARIN
- AŠMARIN, N. I. (1928-50), Theasurus linguae Tschuvaschorum I-XVII. Kazan' - Čeboksary.
- AŠMARIN, N. I. (1898), Materialy dlja issledovanija čuvašskogo jazyka. Kazan'.

- AŠMARIN, N. I. (1902), Bolgary i čuvaši: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 18.
- AŠMARIN, N. I. (1905), Ob odnom musul'manskom mogil'nom kamne v zagorodnom arhierejskom dome v Kazani: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 21, 92-112.
- AŠMARIN, N. I. (1927), Bolgarskie nadpisi najdennye okolo s. Tukmaklā: Izvestija Obščestva Obsledovanija i Izučenija Azerbajdžana 5, 16-21.
- ATALAY, B. (1940-43), Divanü Lûgat-it-türk. Tercümesi I-III. Dizin I-II. Ankara
- ATALAY, B. (1945), Ettuhfet-üz-zekiyye fil-lûgat-it-türkiyye. Istanbul.
- BALASČEV, G. (1909), Starobălgarski kameni nadpisi ot vreme to na velikaja kan Omărtag, sp. Mihalo I, 3, 219-238; 4, 327-345.
- BĂLGARSKI ÉTIMOLOGICĖN REČNIK. I. Ed. by Vl. Georgiev, Iv. Gălăbov, J. Zaimov, St. Ilčev. Sofija 1962 i sl. II. i-krepja 1979.
- BÁLINT, G. (1875), Kazáni-tatár nyelvtanulmányok. Szövegek és fordítás. [Studies in Kazan Tatar linguistics. Texts and translations.] Budapest.
- BÁLINT, G. (1876), Kazáni-tatár nyelvtanulmányok. Kazáni-tatár szótár. [Studies in Kazan Tatar linguistics. A Kazan Tatar dictionary]. Budapest.
- BÁLINT, G. (1877), Kazáni-tatár nyelvtanulmányok. Kazáni-tatár nyelvtan. [Studies in Kazan Tatar linguistics. A Kazan Tatar grammar.] Budapest.
- BANG, W. (1916-17), Über die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen: KSz 17, 112-146.
- BANG, W. (1917-21), Vom Köktürkischen zum Osmanischen. Vorarbeiten zu einer vergleichenden Grammatik des Türkischen I: APAW 1917, Nr. 6; II-III: APAW 1919, Nr. 5; IV: APAW 1921, Nr. 2.
- BANG, W. (1918-19), Aus türkischen Dialekten: KSz 18, 7-28.
- BÁRCZI, G. (1952), Török jövevényszavaink legrégibb rétegé-

- nek kérdéséhez [On the problem of the earliest layer of
Turkic loan-words in Hungarian]: IOK 2, 347-371.
- BÁRCZI, G. (1971), Le traitement de š et de č turcs dans les
mots d'emprunt turcs du protohongrois: Studia Turcica,
BOH XVII. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 39-46.
- BÁRCZI, G. (1972), Quelques conclusions tirées de l'étude des
plus anciens mots d'emprunt turcs du hongrois: AOH 25,
383-390.
- BASKAKOV, N. A. (1969), Vvedenije v izučenie tjurskich jazykov.²
Moskva.
- BASKAKOV, N. A. (1971), Areal'naja konsolidacija drevnejših
narečij i genetičeskoe rodstvo altajskich jazykov: Problemy
obščnosti altajskich jazykov. Ed. by O. P. Sunik. Leningrad,
315-322.
- BASKAKOV, N. A. (1977), Periodizacija istorii razvitija i for-
mirovanija tjurskich jazykov: MSFOu 158, 41-48.
- BATMANOV, I. A. -- A. Č. KUNAA (1963), Pamjatniki drevne-
tjurkskoj pismennosti Tuvy I. Kyzyl.
- RATTAL, A. (1934), Ibnü-Mühennâ Lûgati. Istanbul.
- BAZIN, L. (1974), Les calendriers turcs anciens et medievauz:
Universite de Lille III.
- BEKE, Ö. (1913-19), ēb-hal, ebi-hal, kutya-hal: KSz 14, 218.
- BEKE, Ö. (1935), Zur Lautgeschichte der tschuwassischen
Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen: FUF 23, 64-84.
- BENZING, J. (1944), Die angeblichen bolgartürkischen Lehn-
wörter im Ungarischen: ZDMG 98, 24-27.
- BENZING, J. (1955), Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer
vergleichenden Grammatik: Akademie der Wissenschaften
und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Social-
wissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1955, Nr. 11.
- BENZING, J. (1958), Review on Pritzak 1955: ZDMG 108,
427-430.
- BENZING, J. (1959), Das Tschuwaschische: Fundamenta I,
695-751.
- BENZING, J. (1959a), Das Hunnische, Donaubolgarische und

- Wolgabolgarische (Sprachreste): Fundamenta I, 685-694.
- BERECZKI, G. (1968), W. Steinitz és E. Itkonen finn-ugor vokalizmuselmélete [Die Theorie über den finnisch-ugrischen Vokalismus von W. Steinitz und von E. Itkonen und die tscheremissische Sprache]: NyK 70, 23-34.
- BERECZKI, G. (1971), Zu den Thesen und Antithesen in der finnisch-ugrischen Vokalforschung: UAJb 43, 18-27.
- BERECZKI, G. (1977), Permi-cseremis lexikális kölcsönzések [Permian-Cheremis lexical borrowings]: NyK 79, 57-77.
- BEREZIN, I. (1852), Bulgar na Volge: Učenyje Zapiski Kazanskogo Universiteta 3, 74-160.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1934), Pärvobälgarski nadpisi: Godišnik na Sofijskaja universitet, Istoriko-filologičeski fakultet 31.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1936), Pärvobälgarski nadpisi. Dobavki i opravki: Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, Istoriko-filologičeski fakultet 32.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1955), What was the title ητεργου (ηξεουργου) βοιλας in the Protobulgarien inscriptions?: Byzantinoslavica 16:1, 120-124.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1955a), Les inscriptions du relief de Madara (Nouvelle lecture, compléments et interprétations: Byzantinoslavica 16:2, 212-254.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1958), Die protobulgarischen Inschriften und die Slavistik: Zeitschrift für Slavistik 1, 1-7.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1963), Die protobulgarischen Inschriften, Berlin.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1970), Aus der Geschichte der Protobulgaren: Etudes balkaniques 1970, 2, 39-56.
- BEŠEVLIEV, V. (1979), Pärvo-bälgarski nadpisi. Sofija.
- BLOOMFIELD, L. (1933), Language. New York.
- BOEV, E. (1965), Za predturskoto tjursko vlijanie v bălgarskija ezik - ošče njakolko prabălgarski dumi: Bălgarski ezik 15, pp. 3-17.
- BÖHTLINGK, O. (1851), Die Sprache der Jakuten. Grammatik, Text und Wörterbuch, St. Petersburg.

- BOL'ŠAKOV, O. G. -- A. L. MONGAJT (1971), Putešestvie Abu Hamida al-Garnati v Vostočnuju i Central'nuju Evropu (1131-1153 gg.). Moskva.
- BOROVKOV, A. K. (1963), Leksika sredneaziatskogo tefsira XII-XIII vekov. Moskva.
- BOROZDIN, I. N. (1930), Dva tatarskih nadgrobija bliz gorodišča "Iski Kazan'": Materialy po Ochrane, Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 4, pp. 58-64.
- BROCKELMANN, C. (1928), Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz, BOH I. Budapest.
- BROSSE, M. (1861), Ob armjanskih nadpisjah v Bolgarah: Izvestija Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 2, 181-184.
- BRS 1958: Baškirsko-russkij slovar'. Ed. by K. Z. Ahmerov, T. E. Baišev, etc. Moskva 1958.
- BUDENZ, J. (1862-63), Csuvas közlések és tanulmányok [Notes and studies in Chuvash]: NyK 1, 14-68.
- BUDENZ, J. (1863), Reguly csuvas példamondatai [Reguly's sample sentences in Chuvash]: NyK 2, 189-280.
- BUDENZ, J. (1873), Jelentés Vámbéry Á. magyar-török szógyejeztetéseiről [An account of Á. Vámbéry's Hungarian-Turkic word comparisons]: NyK 10, 67-135.
- BULATOV, A. V. (1963), Bulgarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki XIII-XIV vv. pravoberež'ja Volgi: Épigrafika Vostoka 16, pp. 56-71.
- BULATOV, A. V. (1967), Épigrafičeskie pamjatniki Zakam'ja XIV veka: UZČ 36, 198-215.
- BURANOVA, N. B. (1962), Govor karinskih i glazovskih tatar: Materialy po tatarskoj dialektologii II. Kazan', 16-56.
- BURMOV, A. I. (1954), Kām vāprosa za otnošeniato meždu slavjani i prabālgari prez VII-IX v.: Istorič Pregled 10:1. Sofia, 68-94.
- ČEREMISOV, K. M. -- C. B. CYDENDAMBAEV (1951), Burjat-mongol'sko-russkij slovar'. Moskva.
- ČERNYŠEV, E. I. (1971), Selenija kazanskogo hanstva (po pisčevym knigam): Voprosy étnogeneza tjurkojazyčnyh narodov

- srednego Povolž'ja. Kazan', 272-292,
- CEVEL, J. (1966), Mongol chélnij tovč tajlbar tol'. Ulaanbaatr.
- CINCIUS, V. I. (1949), Sravnitel'naja fonetika tungusoman'ščurskih jazykov. Leningrad.
- CINCIUS, V. I. (1975-1977), Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'-ščurskih jazykov. Materialy k étimologičeskomu slovarju I-II, Leningrad.
- CLAUSON, G. (1972), An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish, Oxford.
- COLLINDER, B. (1960), Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages. Stockholm.
- CSÚCS, S. (1970-72), A votják nyelv orosz jövevényszavai I [Russian loan-words in Votyak]: NyK 72, 323-362, II: NyK 74, 27-47.
- CZEGLÉDY, K. (1944), Egy bolgár-török yiltavār méltóságnév [A Bulgar-Turkic title: yiltavār : MNy 40, 179-186.
- CZEGLÉDY, K. (1951), Zur mescheder Handschrift von Ibn Fadlāns Reisebericht; AOH 1, pp. 217-260.
- CZEGLÉDY, K. (1969), Nomád népek vándorlása Napkelettől Napnyugatig [Wanderings of nomadic peoples from the East to the West]. Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 8. Budapest.
- DAI: Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos: De administrando imperio. Hungarian translation: Gy. Moravcsik, Biborbanszületett Konstantin: A birodalom kormányzása [The governing of the empire], Budapest, 1950.
- DAL', V. (1956), Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka I-IV. Moskva.
- DARKÓ, E. (1924), Zur Frage der urmagyarischen und urbulgarischen Beziehungen: Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum 1, 292-301.
- DÁVID, G. (1976), A Bibliography Containing the Works of Professor Julius Németh Published between 1960-1974: Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh. Ed. by Gy. Káldy-Nagy. Budapest 1976, 357-364.
- DENISOV, P. V. (1959), Religioznoe verovanie čuvaš. Moskva.
- DENY, J. (1947), Une inscription en langue protobulgare dé-

- couvert à Preslav; Revue des études byzantines 5, 235-239.
- DERLEME SÖZLÜĞÜ: Türkiye'de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları. Ankara 1963-
- DEŠKO, A. (1855), Vengerskaja grammatika s russkim tekstom i v sravnenii s čuvašskim i čeremisskim jazykami. Spb.
- DE SMEDT, A. -- A. MOSTAERT (1933), Dictionnaire monguor-français. Peip'ing.
- DEVLET, M. A. (1966), Bol'saja bojarskaja pisanica: SA. 1966:3, 125-142.
- DIMITRIEV, V. D. (1960), Dva opisanija čuvašej i čuvašskie slovari vtoroj četverti XVIII veka: UZČ 19, 270-302.
- DIMITRIEV, V. D. (1969), K voprosu o drevnem čuvašskom kalendar: UZČ 47, 165-185.
- DIMITRIEV, V. D. (1957), Nekotorye istoričeskie dannye k voprosu ob étnogeneze čuvašskogo naroda: O proišhoždenii čuvašskogo 1957.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1966), O nekotoryh russkikh slovah, zaimstvovannyh iz grečeskogo jazyka čerez tjurskoe posredstvo: Leksikologija i slovoobrazovanie drevnerusskogo jazyka. Moskva.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1966a), O metodah issledovanija drevnejših tjurkizmov v sostave russkogo slovarja (K istorii slova žemčug): Izvestija AN SSSR. Serija literatury i jazyka, t. 25, vyp. 1, 57-64.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1967), Ob étimologii bulgarskikh élementov v slavjanskikh jazykah: Meždunarodnyj simpozium "Problemy slavjanskikh étimologičeskikh issledovanij v svjazi s obščej problematikoju sovremennoj étimologii" (24-31 janvarja 1967): Programma. Tezisy dokladov. Moskva.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1967a), Nekotorye voprosy izučenija tjurkizmov v russkom jazyke: Voprosy leksiki i grammatiki russkogo jazyka. (Učenyje zapiski MGPI im. V. I. Lenina, No. 264). Moskva, 364-374.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1967b), Slavjan čelxisenči pälxar-čävaš

- šamaxësem: Čávaš kalendarë 1968, Šupaškar, 36.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1968), Dudak Drofa. Étimologičeskie zametki: Russkaja reč' 1968 No. 4, 100-104.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1968a), K voprosu o bulgarskih élementah v belorusskom jazyke: Problemy belaruskaj filalogii. Tézisy dakladau réspublikanskaj kanferéncyi prisvecnaj 50-goddzju BSSR I KPB. Minsk, 37-40.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1969), Dva gapaksa iz "Leksikona vokaby lam novym" (Šomorlyk. Balahaj): UZČ 39, 234-235.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1969a), Slavjane i tjurki: Russkaja reč' 1969, No. 2, 2-98.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1969b), Bulgarizmy v vostočnoslavjanskijah jazykah: Tjurskie leksičeskie élementy v vostočnyh i zapadnyh slavjanskijah jazykah. Tezisy dokladov vtorogo simpoziuma (25-27 nojabrja 1969 g.). Minsk, 19-21.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1969c), Iz bulgarskogo vklada v slavjanskijah jazykah I: Étimologija 1967. Moskva, 1969, 252-270.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970), Dva bulgarizma v drevnerusskoj étnonimii: Étnonimy. Moskva, 160-164.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970a), Slovar' tjurkizmov: Russkaja reč' 1970, No. 3, 51-58.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970b), Tjurskie leksičeskie élementy v vostočnyh slavjanskijah jazykah: ST 1970:3, 131-143.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970c), Nekotorye soobraženija o bulgarskom vklade v slavjanskijah jazykah: Učenyje zapiski MGPI im. V.I. Lenina, No. 403, 41-53.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970d), Iz bulgarskogo vklada v slavjanskiju antroponimiju (k étimologii imeni Boris'): Antroponimika, 229-236.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1970e), Sostavlenie slovarja tjurskijah leksičeskijah élementov v slavjanskijah jazykah: Russkij jazyk v škole 1970, No. 3, 116-117.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1971), Iz bulgarskogo vklada v slavjanskijah jazykah II: Étimologija 1968. Moskva 1971, 189-196.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1971a), Tjurkizmy slavjanskijah jazykov

- kak istočnik svedenij po istoričeskoj fonetike tjurskih jazykov (sootvestvie s ~ š): ST 1971:2, 81-92.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1971b), K periodizaciji istorii bulgaro-čuvaškogo vokalizma (o hronologii ukan'ja-okan'ja): Tezisy dokladov i soobščenijsveščanija po voprosam dialektologii i istorii jazyka. (Kišinev, 10-12 nojabrja 1971 g.). Moskva, 59-62.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1972), Iz bulgarskogo vklada v slavjanskijah jazykah III: Étimologija 1970. Moskva 1972, 103-115.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1972a), Proishoždenie nazvanija T''murotokan': Dialekty i toponimija Povolž'ja (Materialy i soobščenijsveščanija) vyp. I. Čeboksary, 38-39.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1972b), Bulgarizmy v toponimii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja: Résumés des communications de XI^e congrés international des sciences onomastique, 28 juin - 4 juillet 1972, 53.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1973), O sravnitel'no-istoričeskom izučenii tjurkizmov russkogo jazyka: Voprosy grammatiki i leksiki russkogo jazyka. Sbornik trudov. Moskva, 566-578.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1973a), Bulgarizmy v russko-belorusskijah izoleksah: Belaruska-russkija izaleksy (Matérialy dlja abmerkavannja). Minsk, 36-42.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1973b), T''mytorokan' i Taman': Russkaja reč' 1973, No. 5, 129-133.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1973c), O sravnitel'no-istoričeskom izučenii tjurkizmov russkogo jazyka: Voprosy grammatiki i leksiki russkogo jazyka. Sbornik trudov. Moskva, 566-578.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1973d), Proishoždenie nazvanija Astrahan': Onomastika Povolž'ja, 3. Materialy III. konferencii po onomastike Povolž'ja. Ufa, 216-227.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1974), K istoriografii izučenija tjurkizmov v russkom jazyke: ST 1974:5, 72-75.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1974a), Tjurkizmy slavjanskijah jazykov kak istočnik svedenij po istoričeskoj fonetike tjurskih ja-

- zykov (k voprosy o razvitii tak nazyvaemogo protetičeskogo soglasnogo v- v tjurskih jazykah: ST 1974:2, 34-43.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1975), Otraženie tjurskogo načal'nogo j- v bulgarizmah slavjanskih jazykov: ST 1975:3, 23-35.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1975a), Bulgarskie sledy na karte: Russkaja reč' 1975, No. 6, 87-92.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1976), K voprosu o vengerskom sz-sootvetstvujuščem tjurskomu j-, v staryh bulgarizmah. Tjurkologičeskie issledovanija, Moskva, 112-125.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1976a) Astrahan': Russkaja reč' 1976, No. 3, 114-116.
- DOBRODOMOV, I. G. (1976b), Voprosy hronologii tjurskih zaimstvovanij v slavjanskij jazykah: ST 1976:6, 24-37.
- DOERFER, G. (1962), Zur Bezeichnung der Westtürken: CAJ 7, 256-263.
- DOERFER, G. (1963-75), Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen I-IV. Wiesbaden.
- DOERFER, G. (1965), Ältere westeuropäische Quellen zur kalmükischen Sprachgeschichte. Wiesbaden.
- DOERFER, G. (1966), Review on Németh 1964: ZDMG 116, 199-200.
- DOERFER, G. (1967), Türkisch -n > tschuwaschisch -m?: UAJb 39, 53-70.
- DOERFER, G. (1968), Ein Kompendium der Turkologie: UAJb 40, 242-246.
- DOERFER, G. (1968a), Die Entsprechung der türkischen Langvokale im Tungusischen: UAJb 40, 39-49.
- DOERFER, G. (1968b), Vorfort zu: Nikolaj Ivanovich Ashmarin, Thesaurus linguae Tschuvaschorum, vols. 1-17 Kazan', 1928-1950. (Reprint, UAS 70, V-VIII).
- DOERFER, G. (1971), Bemerkungen zur Methodik der türkischen Lautlehre: OLZ 66, cc. 326-344.
- DOERFER, G. (1971a), Khalaj Materials, Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 115.
- DOERFER, G. (1973), Zur Sprache der Hunnen: CAJ 17, 1-50.

- DOERFER, G. (1973a), Tschuwaschisch -m < urtürkisch^x -m
(> gemeintürkisch -n): UAJb 45, 174-212.
- DOERFER, G. (1975), Altertümliche türkische Wörter im
Chaladsch: 1. Türk Dili Bilimsel Kurultayına Sunulan
Bildiriler 1972 (1975), 255-160.
- DOERFER, G. (1975-76), Das Vorosmanische (die Entwicklung
der oghusischen Sprachen von den Orchoninschriften bis
zu Sultan Veled): Türk Dili Arastirmaları Yıllığı Bel-
leten 1975-76, pp. 81-131.
- DOERFER, G. (1975-76a), Proto-Turkic: Reconstruction Pro-
blems: Türk Dili Arastirmaları Yıllığı Belleten 1975-76,
1-59.
- DONNER, K. (1924), Zu den ältesten Berührungen zwischen
Samojeden und Türken: JSFOu 40, 3-42.
- Duhovnaja ceremonija proizvodivšajasja vo vremja vsevo-
zdelennejšego prisutstvija eja Imperatorskogo Veličestva
...Ekateriny vtoryja v Kazane, 1767.
- DUL'SKIJ, P. (1929), Neskol'ko slov po povodu ornamentirovki
tatarskih pamjatnikov XVI-XVII vv.: Materialy po Ohrane
Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 3, 22-26.
- DUL'SKIJ, P. M. (1936), Materialy po tatarskomu
Trudy Kazanskogo Instituta Inženerov, Kommnal'nogo
Stroitel'stva im. Gor'kogo 4, 75-77.
- DUL'ZON, A. P. (1961), Slovarnye materialy XVIII v. po
ketskim narečijam: Učenyje Zapiski 19:2, Tomskij Gosudar-
stvennyj Pedagogičeskij Institut, Tomsk, 152-189.
- DYEN, I. (1969), Reconstruction, the Comparative Method and
the Proto-language Uniformity Assumption: Language 45,
499-518.
- ECKMANN, J. (1956), Nehcū'l-feradis I. Tipkibasım. Ankara.
- ECSEDY, I. (1975), Böz - An Exotic Cloth in the Chinese Im-
perial Court: Altorientalische Forschungen III, 145-153.

- EEM: Az etimológia elmélete és módszere [The theory and methods of etymology]. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 89. Ed. by L. Benkő and É.K. Sal. Budapest 1976.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1930), Vvedenie v izučenie čuvašskogo jazyka. Moskva.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1949), Čuvašskie slovari XVIII veka: UZČ 2, 111-142.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1950), Étnogenez čuvašej po dannym jazyka: Sovetskaja Étnografija 1950:3, 79-92.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1954), Sovremennij literaturnyj čuvašskij jazyk v sravnitel'no-istoričeskom osveščanii I. Čeboksary 2nd. rev. edition 1971.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1954a), Čävašla-vyräsla slovar'. Čeboksary.
- EGOROV, V.G. (1964), Étimologičeskij slovar' čuvašskogo jazyka. Čeboksary.
- ÉRDMAN, P.F. (1932), O nadgrobnyh nadpisjah v Bolgarah: Zavolžskij Muravej 1832:21-22, 1219-1230, 1342-1358.
- EREN, H. (1941-43), Beiträge zur türkischen Wortforschung: Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum 3, 129-143.
- EREN, H. (1950), Ibn Mühenna lugati hakkında: Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar, 1950, 150-158.
- EREN, H. (1953), Onomatopée'lere ait notlar: Türkiyat Mecmuası 10, 55-58.
- EREN, H. (1958), Türkce GÖK kelimesinin türevleri: Jean Deny Armağanı. Ankara, 85-89.
- ERGIN, M. (1963), Dede Korkut Kitabı II. Ankara.
- ESK: V.I. Lytkin--E.S. Guljaev, Kratkij étimologičeskij slovar' komi jazyka. Moskva 1970.
- EVSEEV, M.E. (1963), Osnovy mordovskoj grammatiki. (Izbrannye trudy v pjati tomah). Saransk.
- EVTJUHOVA, L.--S.KISELEV, Čaa-tas u sela Kopëny: Trudy GIM XI. Moskva 1940, 21-54.
- FAHRUTDINOV, R.G. (1975), Arheologičeskie pamjatniki volžsko-kamskoj Bulgarii i ee territorija. Kazan'.
- FASMER, R. Étimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka pere-

- vod s nemeckogo i dopolnenija O.N. Trubačeva, I-IV,
Moskva 1964-1973.
- FASMER, R.R. (1926), O monetah volžskih bolgar X. veka:
Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii i Étnografii 33, 29-60.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1962), O nazvanijah dnei u čuvašej: UZČ
21, 245-259.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1965), Istoričeskie svjazi čuvašskogo jazyka
s jazykami ugro-finnov Povolž'ja i Permi. Čeboksary.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1968), Istoričeskie svjazi čuvašskogo jazyka
s volžskimi i permskimi finno-ugorskimi jazykami. Če-
boksary.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1970), Zametki o finno-ugorskih élementah
v nekotoryh geografičeskikh nazvanijah Čuvašii: SFu 6,
127-135.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1972), K voprosu o drevnečuvašskoj pis' -
mennosti: ST 1972:5, pp. 108-114.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1977), O nekotoryh oguzskikh čertah čuvaš-
skogo jazyka: ST 1977:1, 25-32.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1979a), Otnošenje čuvašskogo i obščetjur-
skogo jazykov k jazykam Hazar, dunajskih i volžskih
Bulgar i finno-ugrov: Trudy NTT 87, 3-40.
- FEDOTOV, M.R. (1979b), Otnošenje čuvašskogo i obščetjur-
skogo jazykov k jazykam Hazar, dunajskih i volžskih Bul
gar, a takže finno-ugrov: ST 1979:3, 25-37.
- FEHÉR, G. (1921), Bulgarisch-ungarische Beziehungen in den
V-XI. Jahrhunderten: KSz 19:2, 1-190.
- FEHÉR, G. (1931), Les monuments de la culture protobulgare
et leurs relations hongroises: Arheologia Hungarica 7. .
- FEHÉR, G. (1940), A bolgár-törökök szerepe és műveltsége
(A bolgár-törökök és a honfoglaló magyarok hatása a ke-
let-európai művelődés kialakulásában) [The role and the
civilization of the Bulgar-Turks (The influence of the Bul-
gar-Turks and the conquering Hungarians on the formation
of the Eastern-European civilization)]. Budapest.
- FEHÉR, G. (1959), Zur Geschichte der Steppenvölker von Süd-

- russland im 9-10. Jh.; Studia Slavica 5, 257-326.
- FEJZHANOV, H. (1863), Tri nadgrobnih bulgarskih nadpisi: Izvestija Imperatorskogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 4, 395-404.
- FEOKTISTOV, A. P. (1965), K probleme mordovsko-tjurskich jazykovykh kontaktov: Etnogenez mordovskogo jazyka. Saransk, 331-343.
- FILIN, F. P. (1962), Obrazovanie jazyka vostočnyh slavjan. Moskva.
- FILIPOVA, T. M. (1973), O nekotoryh tjurskich élementah v leksike sel'kupskogo jazyka: Proishozhdenie aborigenov Sibirii i ih jazykov. Tomsk, 76-79.
- FILIPOVA, T. M. (1974), O nekotoryh rezultatov sopostavlenija sel'kupskoj leksiki s tjurskoj: Voprosy jazyka i literatury narodov Sibirii. Novosibirsk, 81-86.
- FILIPOVA, T. M. (1976), O sootvetstvii značenij v nekotoryh sel'kupsko-tjurskich slovarnyh obščnostjah: Jazyki i toponimija I. Tomsk, 50-52.
- FOKOS-FUCHS, D. R. (1959), Syrjānisches Wörterbuch I-II. Budapest.
- FRAEHN, C. N. (1816), De numorum bulgaricorum forte antiquissimo commentationis critico-philologico-historicae liber secundus. Casani.
- FRAEHN, C. M. (1832), Drei Münzen der Wolga-Bulgaren: Mémoires de l'Académie Imp. ser VI, I.
- FUKS, K. F. (1817), Kratkaja istorija goroda Kazani. Kazan'.
- FUKS, K. F. (1899), Istorija goroda Kazani. Kazan'.
- FUV: B. Collinder (1955), Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Languages. Stockholm.
- GABAIN, A. von (1959), Die Sprache des Codex Comanicus: Fundamenta I, 46-73.
- GARIPOV, T. M. (1972), Starotjurskie pis'mennye pamjatniki Baškirii: ST 1972:4, 39-45.
- Gen.: A. GENETZ (1897), Ost-permische Sprachstudien: JSFOu 15, 1-57.
- GENING, V. F. -- A. H. HALIKOV (1964), Rannye bolgari na Volge.

Moskva.

GOL'STUNSKIJ, K. F. (1893-96), Mongol'sko-russkij slovar'

I-III, Dopoln. St. Petersburg.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1905), Az altaji nyelvek hangtörténetéhez [On the historical phonology of the Altaic languages]: NyK 35, 241-282.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1907), Régi török jövevényszavaink [Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian]: MNy 3, 17-29, 62-72, 105-116, 153-165, 213-224, 250-263, 307-318, 357-370, 395-406.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1908), Honfoglalás előtti török jövevényszavaink [Bulgar-Turkic loan-words in Hungarian dating from the pre-Conquest times]. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 7. Budapest.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1909-10), A magyar a-hangok történetéhez [On the history of Hungarian a-sounds]: NyK 39, 229-274.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1912), Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache: MSFOu 30.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1912a), Zur Lautgeschichte der altaischen Sprachen: KSz 13, 1-37.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1921), Review on Räsänen 1920: Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum I, 81-85.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1921a), Die bulgarische Frage und die ungarische Hunnesagen: UJb 1, 194-203.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1921b), A bolgár kérdés és a magyar hunmonda [The problem of the Bulgars and the Hungarian legend on the Huns]: MNy 17, 15-21.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1921-25), Martti Räsänen, Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen: KCsA I, 81-85.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1927), Slavo-Turcica: Symbolis Grammaticis in honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski, Cracoviae, 71-76.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1928), Bársony [Velvet]: MNy 24, 344.

GOMBOCZ, Z. (1960), Honfoglalás előtti bolgár-török jövevényszavaink [Bulgar-Turkic Loan-words in Hungarian dating from the pre-Conquest times]. Ed. by L. Ligeti, Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 24, Budapest.

- GORDEEV, F.I. (1976), Tatarizmy v leksike marijskogo jazyka: SFu 12, 94-103.
- GRØNBECH, K. (1942), Komanisches Wörterbuch. Kopenhagen.
- GRUZOV, L.P. (1960), Sovremennij marijskij jazyk. Fonetika. Yoŝkar-Ola.
- GRUZOV, L.P. (1969), Istoričeskaja grammatika marijskogo jazyka. Vvedenije i fonetika. Yoŝkar-Ola.
- GYÖRFFY, Gy. (1965), A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról. [On the ancestors of the Hungarians and the Conquest]. Ed. by Gy. Györfy. Budapest.
- HAENISCH, E. (1939), Wörterbuch zu Monghol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi) die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Leipzig.
- HAENISCH, E. (1957), Sinomongolische Glossare I., Das Hua-i-ih-yü: Abh. der Deutschen AdW zu Berlin 1957.
- HAJDÚ, P. (1953), Die ältesten Berührungen zwischen den Samojeden und den jenisseischen Völkern: AOH 3, 73-101.
- HAJDÚ, P. (1954), Die sekundären anlautenden Nasale (ŋ-, n-) im Samojedischen: ALH 4, 17-67.
- HAJDÚ, P. (1963), The Samoyed Peoples and Languages. Bloomington--The Hague 1963.
- HAJDÚ, P. (1968), Chrestomathia Samoiedica. Budapest.
- HAJDÚ, P. (1975), Über die Herkunft des kamassischen Pluralsuffixes -saŋ: UAJb 47, 85-88.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1974), Konsonantizm jazyka épitafij volžskih bulgar: Aspekty lingvističeskogo analiza (na materiale jazykov raznyh sistem). Moskva.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1974a), Sledy dialektov v jazyke pamjatnikov Volžskoj Bulgarii. Tezisy dokladov III naučnoj konferencii molodyh učenyh. Kazan'.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1974b), Sledy dialektov v jazyke pamjatnikov Volžskoj Bulgarii: ST 1974:4, 25-31.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1975), Bulgarskie épitafii kak istočnik po istorii tjurskich jazykov Urala i Povolž'ja: Vtoraja Južno-Ural'skaja arheologičeskaja konferencija (tezisy

- dokladov i soobščenij). Ufa.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1976), Jazyk pamjatnikov volžskoj Bulgarii (na materiale épitafij XIII-XIV vv.) Dissertacija. Moskva.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1976a), Leksika jazyka épitafij volžskih bulgar: Kratkoe soderžanie dokladov IV konferencii molodyh naučnyh rabotnikov. Kazan'.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F.S. (1976b), Formy nepolnoj verbal'nosti v bulgarskich épitafijah: Urovni jazyka i ih analiz (na materiale jazykov raznyh sistem). Moskva.
- HAKIMZJANOV, F. (1978), Dvujazučnyh bulgarskij pamjatnik: ST 1978:2, 62-68.
- HALASI-KUN, T. (1947), Philologica I.: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 5, 1-37.
- HALASI-KUN, T. (1950), Orta-Kıpcakçada q-, k- ~ Ø meseleri: Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar 45-61.
- HALASI-KUN, T. (1975), Kipchak Philology and the Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian: Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 1, 155-210.
- HALIKOV, A.H. (1971), Istoki formirovanija tjurkojazyčnyh narodov Povolž'ja i Priural'ja: Voprosy 1971, 7-36.
- HALIKOV see also under KHALIKOV
- HAZAI, G. (1962), Gyula Németh eserleri: Németh Armağanı. Ed. by J. Eckmann, A.S. Levend, M. Mansuroğlu. Ankara, 15-41.
- HERBERSTEIN, S. (1549), Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii. Viennae.
- HLEBNIKOVA, T.A.-E. P. KAZAKOV, K arheologičeskoj karte rannoj volžskoj Bulgarii na territorii TASSR: Iz arheologii Volgokam'ja. Ed. by A.H. Halikov. Kazan', 109-136.
- ISANBAEV, N.I. (1978), Vlijanie tatarskogo jazyka na padežnuju sistemu vostočnomarijskij govoro: SFu 14, 172-177.
- ISANBAEV, N.I. (1979), Strukturno-slovoobrazovatel'nyj analiz tatarskij zaimstvovannyh suščestvitel'nyh v marijskom jazyke: SFu 15, 76-83.

- HOMAN, S. Sh. (1972), A Brief Criticism on the So-Called "Zir-ni Manuscript": ZAS 6, 561-574.
- HOUTSMA, M. Th. (1894), Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar. Leiden.
- HOVDHAUGEN, E. (1972), Some Remarks on the Development of Nasal Phonemes in Chuvash: UAJb 44, 208-212.
- HOVDHAUGEN, E. (1975), The Phonetic System of Early 18th Century Chuvash: CAJ 19, 274-286.
- HOVDHAUGEN, E. (1976), Review on Róna-Tas--Fodor 1973: OLZ 71, cc. 389-391.
- HRBEK, I. (1957), Eine Volksetymologie des Namens 'Bulgar': Charisteria Orientalia... Joanni Rypka, Prague, 113-119.
- Hüen-tsang: A. VON GABAIN, Briefe der uigurischen Hüen-tsang-Biographie: SPAW 1938, 371-414.
- ILLIČ-SVITYČ, V. M. (1971), Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov. Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (B-K). Moskva.
- IL' MINSKIJ, N. I. (1851), Tatarskija nadpisi iz vremen kazanskogo carstva v lajševskom uezde: Zapiski Imperatorskogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 3, 114-118.
- IL' MINSKIJ, N. I. (1865), O fonetičeskich otnošenii meždu čuvašskim i tjurskim jazykami: Izvestija Imperatorskogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 5, 80-84.
- ISANBAEV, N. I. (1979a), Strukturno-slovoobrazovatel'nyj analiz tatarskich zaimstvovanij v dialektah marijskogo jazyka (glagol): Voprosy Marijskogo Jazyka. Voprosy istorii i dialektologii. Yoškar-Ola 1979, 117-137.
- ISANBAEV, N. I. (1979b), Istorija izučeniya tatarskich zaimstvovanij v marijskom jazyke: Voprosy Marijskogo Jazyka. Voprosy istorii i dialektologii. Yoškar-Ola 1979, 5-41.
- ISANBAEV, N. I. (1979c), Fonetičeskaja adaptacija tatarskich zaimstvovanij v dialektah marijskogo jazyka: Voprosy Marijskogo Jazyka. Voprosy istorii i dialektologii. Yoškar-Ola 1979, 41-102.
- ISANBAEV, N. I. (1980), Ob otgraničenii tatarskich zaimstvovanij ot čuvašskich v marijskom jazyke: SFu XVI:3, 183-192.

- ISANBAEV, N.I. (1980a), Problema razgraničenja tatarizmov ot zaimstvovanij iz drugih jazykov: Voprosy Marijskogo Jazyka. Voprosy grammatiki i leksikologii, Yoskar-Ola 1980, 148-182.
- ISTORIJA 1955: Istorija Tatarskoj ASSR I. Kazan'.
- ISTORIJA 1966-67: Istorija Čuvašskoj ASSR I-II. Čeboksary.
- ISTORIJA TATARII 1937: Istorija Tatarii v dokumentah i materialah. Moskva.
- ITKONEN, E. (1954), Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Tscheremissischen und in den permischen Sprachen: FUF 31, 149-345.
- ITKONEN, E. (1955), Über die Betonungsverhältnisse in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen: AL 5, 21-34.
- ITKONEN, E. (1969), Thesen und Antithesen in der finnisch-ugrischen Vokalforschung: UAJb 41, 212-251.
- ITKONEN, E. (1969a), Zur Wertung der finnisch-ugrischen Lautforschung: UAJb 41, 76-111.
- ITKONEN, E. (1970), Bemerkungen über den Vokalismus der ersten Silbe von tschuwaschischen Lehnwörtern in einigen finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen: FUF 38, 257-273.
- ITKONEN, E. (1971-72), Nachträgliche Bemerkungen. 2. Fragen des tscheremissischen Vokalismus: FUF 39, 431-449.
- IVANOV, Jor. (1931), Balgarski starini iz Makedonija, 2 izd., Sofija.
- IVANOV, P.P. (1952), Materialy po istorii mordvy VIII-XI vv., Ed. by A.P. Smirnov. Moršansk.
- IVANOVSKIJ, A.O. (1894), Mandjurica I. Obrazcy solonskogo i dahurskago jazykov. St. Pbg.
- IWAMURA, Sh. (1961), The Zirni Manuscript. Kyoto.
- IZBUDAK, V. (1936), El-Idrak Haşiyesi. Istanbul.
- IZNOSKOV, I.A. (1893a), Épigraphique pamjatnik volžskoj Bulgarii: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 11:3, 278-280.
- Izvestija Al-Bekri i drugih avtorov o rusi i slavjanah. Čast' 1. (Stat'i i razyskanija A. Kunika i barona V. Rozena.) Pri-

- loženie k XXXII-mu tomu Zapisok Imp. Akademij nauk N^o
2. Sanktpeterburg, 1878, Čast' 2. 1903.
- JAKOVLEV, I. Ja. (1872), Bukvar' dlja obučenija čuvašskih de-
tej gramote. Kazan'.
- JANHUNEN, J. (1977), Samoyed-Altaic Contacts. Present State
of Research: MSFOu 158, 123-129.
- JANHUNEN, J. (1977a), Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemein-
samojedische Etymologien. Helsinki.
- JANINA, S. A. (1962), Novye dannye o monetnom čekane Volž-
skoj Bolgarii X. v.: MIA 111, 179-204.
- JOKI, A. J. (1952), Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen:
MSFOu 103.
- JOKI, A. J. (1973), Uralier und Indogermanen. Die älteren Be-
rührungen zwischen den uralischen und indogermanischen
Sprachen: MSFOu 151.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1951), Tatarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki XV.
v. (K voprosu o proishoždenii kazanskih tatar): Épigrafika
Vostoka 5, 78-94.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1953), O nekatoryh bulgarskich épigrafičeskich
pamjatnikah: Épigrafika Vostoka 7, 26-29.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1956), K voprosu ob istorii i klassifikacii
bulgaro-tatarskoj épigrafiki: Épigrafika Vostoka 11, 44-53.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1959), Dve nadgrobnye nadpisi s drevnego
baškirskogo kladbišča: Voprosy baškirskoj filologii.
Moskva, 120-122.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1960), Vvedenie v bulgaro-tatarskuju épigra-
fiku, Moskva-Leningrad.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1963), Novye nahodki épigrafičeskogo perioda kazan-
skogo hanstva: Épigrafika Vostoka 16, 68-78.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1971), Bulgaro-tatarskaja épigrafika i topo-
nimika, kak istočnik issledovanija étnogeneza kazanskih
tatar: Voprosy 1971, 217-231.
- JUSUPOV, G. V. (1972), Itogi polevyh épigrafičeskich issledo-
vanyj 1961-1963 gg. v Tatarskoj ASSR: Épigrafika Vostoka
21, 48-55.

- JUSUPOV, G. V. -- G. M. HISAMUTDINOV, Bulgarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki XVI v. najdennye letom 1947 g.: Épigrafika Vostoka 4, 68-75.
- JYRKÄNKALLIO, P. (1952), Zur Etymologie von russ. tolmač 'Dolmetscher' und seiner türkischen Quelle: Studia Orientalia 17:8. Helsinki.
- KAHOVSKIJ, V. F. (1965), Proišhoždenie čuvašskogo naroda. Čeboksary.
- KAHOVSKIJ, V. F. -- A. P. SMIRNOV (1972), Hulaš: Gorodišče Hulaš i pamjatniki srednevekov'ja Čuvašskogo Povolž'ja. Čeboksary, 3-73.
- KAKUK, S. (1973), Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue osmanlie des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles. Les éléments osmanlis de la langue hongroise. BOH XIX, Budapest.
- KAKUK, Zs. (1980), Hungarian Turkology 1945-1974. Bibliography. Ed. by Zs. Kakuk. Oriental Studies 5. Budapest.
- KALIMA, J. (1910), Die russischen Lehnwörter im Syrjänschen: MSFOu 29.
- KALININ, N. F. (1948), K voprosu o proišhoždenii kazanskich tatar: Proišhoždenie 1948, 90-107.
- KALININ, N. F. (1956), Bulgaro-tatarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki kak istoričeskij istočnik: Tezisy 1956, 25-31.
- KALINKA, E. (1906), Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien. Wien.
- KÁLMÁN, B. (1961), Die russischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen. Budapest.
- KALUŽYŃSKI, S. (1961), Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache. Warszawa.
- KALUŽIŃSKI, S. (1969-70), Dagurisches Wörterverzeichnis nach F. V. Muroskis handschriftlichen Sprachaufzeichnungen: RO 33: 1-2, 103-144, 109-143.
- KANITZ, F. (1879), Donau-Bulgarien, 1. Aufl. I-III. Leipzig.
- KANNISTO, A. (1925), Die tatarischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen: FUF 17, 1-264.
- KARA, G. (1953), Un glossaire uŷumčin: AOH 16, 1-43.
- KARA, G. (1959), Notes sur les dialectes oirat de la Mon-



- golie Occidentale: AOH 8, 111-168.
- KARA, G. (1970), Chante d'un barde mongol. Budapest.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1895), Novye priobretenija Muzeja Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii v 1895: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 13, 234-243.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1898), Opisanie odnogo metalličeskogo zerkala s arabskoju nadpis'ju: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 14, 1-5.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1905), Épigrافيčeskij pamjatnik Volžskoj Bulgarii: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 21, 263-268.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1920), Čuvašskie slova v bolgarskih i tatarskih pamjatnikah, Kazan'.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1921a), Épigrافيčeskij pamjatnik Volžskoj Bulgarii: Kazanskij Muzejnyj Vestnik No 1-2, 54-56.
- KATANOV, N. F. (1921b), O nekotoryh vostočnyh veščah Kazanskogo gorodskogo Muzeja. O tatarskih veščah s arabskimi nadpisjami. II O marmornam bljude iz Samarkanda: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 30, 97-102.
- KATZ, H. (1979), Beitrag zur Lösung des Problems der Entwicklung von Ursam^x j im selkupischen und der hiemit zusammenhängenden Fragen der historischen Morphologie dieser Sprache und des Uralischen: SFu 1979:3, 168-176.
- KAZAKOV, E. P. (1967), K voprosu ob étničeskom sostave naselenija rannebolgarskogo gosudarstva: Tezisy dokladov naučnoj konferencii molodyh učenyh. Kazan', 75-78.
- KAZAKOV, E. P. (1978), Pamjatniki bolgarskogo vremeni v vostočnyh rajonah Tatarii. Moskva.
- KECSKEMÉTI, I. (1965), H. Paasonen's Tatarisches Dialektwörterverzeichnis: JSFOu 66, 1-47.
- KEL'MAKOV, V. K. (1975), Elementy palatalnoj garmonii glasnyh v tatyšlinskom dialekte udmurtskogo jazyka: SFu 9, 33-42.
- KHALIKOV, A. H. -- J. G. MUHAMETSIN, Unpublished Volga Bulgarian Inscriptions: AOH 31, 107-125.

- KISPÁL, M. Sz. (1951), Ugor-török érintkezés [Ugric--Turkic contacts]: NyK 53, 49-64.
- KLAPROTH, J. (1831), Notice et explication des inscriptions de Bulgari: JA 1831, 483-503.
- K. Mil'kovič o čuvasah, Severnyj Arhiv 1827, c. 27 No. 9, 47-67, No. 10, 120-139, No. 11, 210-232.
- KONONOV, A. N. (1972), Mahmud Kašgarskij i ego "Divanu lugat it-türk": ST 1972:1, 3-17.
- KORENCHY, É. (1971), A zürjén abszolut igető problémájáról [Zum Problem des absoluten Verbalstammes im Syrjänschen]: NyK 73, 153-162.
- KORNILOV, P. E. (1929a), K izučeniju épigrafičeskogo reznogo kamnja bolgaro-tatarsoj épohi: Materialy po Ohrane, Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 3, 1-10.
- KORNILOV, P. E. (1929b), Bolgarskie pamjatniki za gody revoljucii (Ohrana, remont i izučenie): Vystavka bolgarskih drevnostej, Kazan' 9-18.
- KOTWICZ, W. (1953), Contributions aux études altaïques: RO 16, 327-368.
- KOVALEVSKIJ, A. P. (1954), Čuvaši i bulgary po dannym Ahmeda Ibn-Fadlana: UZČ 9, 1-64.
- KOVALEVSKIJ, A. P. (1956), Kniga Ahmeda ibn-Fadlana o ego putešestvii na Volgu, Harkov'.
- KÖVESI, M. A. (1965), A permi nyelvek ősi képzői [Ancient suffixes of the Permian languages]. Budapest.
- KOWALEWSKI, J. E. (1844-49), Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français I-III, Kazan'.
- KRAČKOVSKAJA, V. A. (1949), Évolucija kufičeskogo pis'ma v Srednej Azii: Épigrafika Vostoka 2, 2-27.
- KRAČKOVSKAJA, V. A. (1963), Arabskaja épigrafika v SSSR za sorok let: Épigrafika Vostoka 15, 110-116.
- Kratkij ukazatel' 1895: Kratkij ukazatel' kazanskogo publičnogo Muzeja im. A. F. Lihačeva, Kazan'.
- KRUEGER, J. R. (1968), Cheremis-Chuvash Lexical Relationships. An index to Räsänen's Chuvash Loanwords in Cheremis.

The Hague.

- KURYŠŽANOV, A.K. (1970), Issledovanija po leksike "tjursko-arabsko slovarja". Alma Ata.
- LAKÓ, Gy. (1934), A permi nyelvek szóvégi magánhangzói [Vowels in the final position in the Permian languages]. Finnugor Értekezések 2, Budapest.
- LANDSBERGER, B. (1942), Sümerler: Ankara Ünverssitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 1/5, 89-96.
- LAUFER, E. (1916), Loan Words in Tibetan: TP 17, 403-552.
- LEE, K. (1964), Mongolian Loanwords in Middle Korean: UAJB 35, 188-197.
- LEPEHIN, I. (1771), Drevnye zapiski putešestvija I. SPbg, 272-282. 2nd edition SPbg. 1795, 272-282.
- LESSING, F.D. (1973), Mongolian-English Dictionary, compiled by M. Haltod, J.G. Hangin, S. Kassatkin, F.D. Lessing. Bloomington.
- LEVITSKAJA, L.S. (1966), Zametki o fonetike Ćuvašskih govorov: Voprosy dialektologii tjurskih jazykov. IV. Baku, 182-185.
- LEVITSKAJA, L.S. (1967), Zametki o Ćuvaško-tatarskih jazykovyh svjazah: UZĆ 34, 140-144.
- LEVITSKAJA, L.S. (1974), Ćuvašskie étimologii: ST 1974:2, 80-84.
- LEVITSKAJA, L.S. (1976), Istoričeskaja morfologija Ćuvaškogo jazyka. Moskva.
- LEWICKI, M. (1949-1959), La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389. Édition critique précédée des observations philologiques et accompagnée de la reproduction phototypique du texte. Wroclaw 1949, II, Vocabulaire-index. Wroclaw.
- LIGETI, L. (1921), Deskó Endre csuvas-magyar nyelvhasonlítása [Endre Deskó's Chuvash-Hungarian comparative linguistics]: Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum 1, 319-320.
- LIGETI, L. (1926), Álmos: MNy 22, 80-82.
- LIGETI, L. (1933), Rapport préliminaire d'un voyage d'explo-

- ration fait en Mongolie chinoise 1928-1931, Budapest.
- LIGETI, L. (1933a), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (Szőlő; üd-ül, egy; ör-öl, ör-vény) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Szőlő 'grapes'; üd-ül 'refresh, rest', egy 'sacred'; ör-öl 'grind', ör-vény 'whirlpool')]: MNy 29, 275-279.
- LIGETI, L. (1933b), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (kar, kár) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (kar 'arm' and kár 'damage, loss')]: MNy 29, 218-221.
- LIGETI, L. (1933c), Szűcs [Furrier]: MNy 29, 157-160.
- LIGETI, L. (1934), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (kapú, koporsó) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (kapú 'gate' and koporsó 'coffin')]: MNy 30, 200-208.
- LIGETI, L. (1935), Mongolos jövevényszavaink kérdése [The problem of the alleged Mongolian loan-words in Hungarian]: NyK 49, 190-271.
- LIGETI, L. (1935a), Szűnyog [Gnat]: NyK 49, 271.
- LIGETI, L. (1935b), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (Ökör, ölyv) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Ökör 'ox' and ölyv 'sparrow-hawk')]: MNy 31, 35-41.
- LIGETI, L. (1935c), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (Sűrű) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Sűrű 'thick, dense')]: MNy 31, 218-222.
- LIGETI, L. (1937), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (Gyomor) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Gyomor 'stomach')]: MNy 33, 221-227, 280.
- LIGETI, L. (1937a), Régibb török jövevényszavaink magyarázatához (Kanyaró; berke; tok) [Contributions to the etymologies of some Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Kanyaró 'measles'; berke 'catkin, raceme'; tok 'sturgeon')]: MNy

33, 300-304.

LIGETI, L. (1938), Les voyelles longues en turc: JA 1, 177-204.

LIGETI, L. (1946), A török szókészlet története és török jövevényszavaink. Göngy. [The history of the Turkic wordstock and the Turkic loan-words in Hungarian. Göngy 'pearl']; MNy 42, 1-17.

LIGETI, L. (1947), Boszorkány [Witch]: MNy 43, 10-17.

LIGETI, L. (1950), Mots de civilisation de Haute Asie en transcription chinoise: AOH 1, 141-188.

LIGETI, L. (1953), Az uráli és altaji nyelvek viszonyának kérdése [The problem of the relation between the Uralic and Altaic languages]: IOK 4, 333-364.

LIGETI, L. (1953a), Histoire du lexique des langues turques: RO 17, 80-91.

LIGETI, L. (1954), Le lexique moghol de R. Leech: AOH 4, 119-158.

LIGETI, L. (1956), Török jövevényszavaink és a vitás etimológiák kérdése (Torontyl, torontal) [Turkic loan-words in Hungarian and the problem of debated etymologies (Torontayl, torontal 'a kind of small bird of prey')]: Emlékkönyv Pais Dezső hetvenedik születésnapjára [A memorial volume on the 70th birthday of Dezső Pais], Budapest, 336-346.

LIGETI, L. (1958), A török szófejtés és török jövevényszavaink (Elöljáró megjegyzések. Magyar íz 'artus, articulus', török yüz 'ua.'; gyűrű, szérű. [Turkic etymologies and Turkic loan-words in Hungarian (Preliminary remarks. Hungarian íz 'artus, articulus', Turkic yüz 'id.'; gyűrű "ring", szérű "threshing-floor"]): MNy 44, 435-450.

LIGETI, L. (1960), Les anciens éléments mongols dans le mandchou: AOH 10, 231-248.

LIGETI, L. (1960a), Néhány megjegyzés úgynevezett altaji jövevényszavainkról [Some remarks on the so-called Altaic loan-words in Hungarian]: MNy 56, 289-303.

LIGETI, L. (1961), A propos des éléments "altaïques" de la langue hongroise: ALH 11, 15-42.

- LIGETI, L. (1962), Dengizikh és Bécs állítólagos kun megfelelői [Dengizikh and Bécs and their reputed corresponding words in Cumanian]: MNy 58, 146-152.
- LIGETI, L. (1962a), Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul: AOH 14, 3-99.
- LIGETI, L. (1963), Uráli török jövevényszavaink kérdéséhez [On the problem of the Turkic loan-words in Hungarian borrowed during the Uralic period]: MNy 59, 381-393.
- LIGETI, L. (1963a), Gyarmat és Jenő: Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv életrajza köréből [Gyarmat and Jenő: Studies in the history of the Hungarian language]: Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 40, 230-239.
- LIGETI, L. (1964), Les voyelles longues en moghol: AOH 17, 1-48.
- LIGETI, L. (1964a), A magyar nép mongol kori nevei (magyar, baskír, király) [Names for the Hungarians used during the Mongolian Epoch (magyar, baskír, király)]: MNy 40, 385-404.
- LIGETI, L. (1966), Az idő és társai (Idő, idén; kor, korán; késik, későn) [On the Hungarian word idő 'time' and some related words (Idő 'time', idén 'this year'; kor 'age', korán 'early'; késik 'be late', későn 'late')]: MNy 62, 385-398.
- LIGETI, L. (1967), Turkológiai megjegyzések szláv jövevényszavainkhoz [Turkological remarks on the Slavic loan-words in Hungarian]: MNy 63, 427-441.
- LIGETI, L. (1968), A harang mint csörgő, csengettyű és kolomp [The Hungarian word harang 'bell' in the meaning 'rattle, hand-bell' and 'cattle bell'] : MNy 64, 75-78.
- LIGETI, L. (1969), A jó szagú gyopártól a havasi gyopárig [From the scented cudweed to the edelweiss : MNy 65, 136-144.
- LIGETI, L. (1970), Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi: Mongolian Studies, BOH XIV. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 265-308.
- LIGETI, L. (1970a), Orsó szavunk török háttere [The Turkic background of the Hungarian word orsó 'spindle'] : MNy 66, 412-421.

- LIGETI, L. (1971), Histoire secrète des mongols. Monumenta linguae mongolicae collecta I. Budapest.
- LIGETI, L. (1973), Az altaji nyelvrokonság és a szókészlet-statisztika [The relationship of the Altaic languages and lexico-statistics]: A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei 28, 259-265.
- LIGETI, L. (1975), Quelques problèmes étymologiques des anciens mots d'emprunt turcs de la langue hongroise: AOH 29, 279-288.
- LIGETI, L. (1976), Régi török jövevényszavaink etimológiai problémái [Old Turkic loan-words in Hungarian and their etymological questions]: Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 89, 193-199.
- LIGETI, L. (1976a), A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van [Old Turkic--Hungarian linguistic contacts the problems connected with them]: MNy 72, 11-27, 129-136.
- LIGETI, L. (1977), Börtű és világosan török eredetű szavaink [Börtű 'small metal balls used for decoration in ironwork' and other loan-words of clear Turkic origin in Hungarian]: MNy 73, 146-154.
- LIGETI, L. (1977a), A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van I. [Old Turkic-Hungarian linguistic contacts the problems connected with them]. Budapest Oriental Reprints Series A 1. Ed. by E. Schütz and É. Apor. Budapest.
- LIGETI, L. (1978), Régi török eredetű neveink I. [Hungarian names of Old Turkic origin]: MNy 74, 257-274.
- LIGETI, L. (1979), A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai és ami körülöttük van II. [Old Turkic-Hungarian linguistic contacts the problems connected with them]: Budapest Oriental Reprints Series A 2. Ed. by E. Schütz and É. Apor. Budapest.
- LIGETI, L. (1980), A propos du Rhotacisme et du Lambdacisme: CAJ 24, 222-250.
- LIHAČEV, N. P. (1890), Novaja nahodka veščej v g. Bulgare: Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Russkogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 5, 105-108.
- LIIMOLA, M. (1954), Etymologische Bemerkungen: FUF 31,

346-361.

- LINDER WELIN, U.S. (1967), Volgabulgharsika furstar i svenska silverskatter: Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Medlemsblad 1967, 170-172.
- LOPAREV, H.M. (1888), Dve zametki po drevnej bolgarskoj istorii: Zapiski imper. russk. arheol. obščestva 3, 341-362.
- LUVSANDÉNDÉV 1957: Mongol'sko-russkij slovar'. Ed. by A. Luvsandéndév. Moskva.
- Lytč.: V.I. LYTKIN (1961), Komi-jazvinskij dialekt. Moskva.
- Lytč., Drevn.: V.I. LYTKIN (1952), Drevnepermskij jazyk. Čtenie tekstov, grammatika, slovar'. Moskva.
- LYTKIN, V.I. (1928), Drevnerusskie š, ž -- zyrjanskije š, ž: Doklady AN SSSR 1928, 298-301.
- LYTKIN, V.I. (1964), Istoričeskij vokalizm permskijh jazykov, Moskva.
- LYTKIN, V.I. (1967), O drevnetjurskijh élementah v leksike permskijh jazykov: Voprosy finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija 4, 131-142.
- LYTKIN, V.I. (1971), K étimologii slov ugry i jugra: Étimologija 1968. Moskva, 197-206.
- LYTKIN, V.I. -- E.S. GULJAEV (1970), Kratkij étimologičeskij slovar' komi jazyka, Moskva.
- MAGNICKIJ, V. (1888), O čuvašah.
- MAHMUTOVA, L.T. (1955), Fonetičeskije osobennosti kasimovskogo govora tatarskogo jazyka: Materialy po dialektologii. Kazan', 135-156.
- MALOV, S.E. (1921), Recenzija na N.F. Katanov, Čuvašskie slova v bolgarskijh i tatarskijh pamjatnikah, 1920: Izvestija Severno-vostočnogo Arheologičeskogo i Étnografičeskogo Instituta 2, 131-133.
- MALOV, S.E. (1926), Zamok iz Biljarska s arabskoj nadpis'ju: Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov 2, 155-162.
- MALOV, S.E. (1947), Bulgarskie i tatarskie épigrafičeskije pamjatniki: Épigrafika Vostoka 1, 38-45.
- MALOV, S.E. (1948), Bulgarskaja i tatarskaja épigrafika: Épi-

- grafika Vostoka 2, 41-48.
- MARJANI, Šinab ad-Din (1897), Mustafad al-ahbar fi ahwal Kazan wa Bulgar I-II. Kazan' 1897-1900.
- MÁRK, T. (1975-76), Über die türkischen Lehnwörter im Sölkupischen: Acta Univ. Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Sectio Ethnographica et Linguistica - Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány 19-20, 243-252.
- MARQUART, J. (1898), Die Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften. Leipzig.
- MARQUART, J. (1911), Die altbulgarischen Ausdrücke in der Inschrift von Catalar und der bulgarischen Fürstenliste: Izvestija Russkago arheologičeskago instituta v Konstantinopole, Sofija 4-16 (1899-1912) 15, 1-30.
- MARQUART, J. (1924), Ein arabischer Bericht über die arktischen (uralischen) Länder aus dem 10. Jahrhundert: UJb 4, 261-334.
- MARTIN, S.E. (1961), Dagur Mongolian: Grammar, Texts, and Lexicon. Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series vol. 6. Bloomington.
- MATERIALY 1948: Materialy po istorii Tatarii I, Kazan'.
- MATERIALY 1957: Materialy po grammatike sovremennogo čuvašskogo jazyka I. Morfologija. Čeboksary.
- MELIORANSKIJ, P.M. (1904), Arab filolog o mongol'skom jazyke: Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Russkogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 15, 75-171.
- MENGES, K.H. (1951), Altaic Elements in the Proto-Bulgarian Inscriptions: Byzantion 21, 85-118.
- MENGES, K.H. (1951-52), Titles and organizational terms of the Qytañ (Liao) and Qara-Qytañ (Ši Liao): RO 17, 68-79.
- MENGES, K.H. (1968), The Turkic Languages and Peoples. Wiesbaden.
- MENGES, K.H. (1968a), Review on Egorov 1964: UAJb 40, 263.
- MÉSZÁROS, Gy. (1909), Csuvas népköltési gyűjtemény I. A csuvas óavallás emlékei. [An anthology of Chuvash folk-poetry I. Monuments of the Chuvash pre-historical religion]. Budapest.

- MÉSZÁROS, Gy. (1912), Csuvas népköltési gyűjtemény II. Közmondások, találós-mondások, dalok, mesék. [An anthology of Chuvash folk-poetry II. Proverbs, riddles, songs and tales]. Budapest.
- MIL'KOVIČ 1898: Istoriografičeskoe opisanie o Kazanskoj gubernii Kapitana Mil' koviča: IOAIÉ 14:5.
- MILLER, G. F. (1758), Nachricht von dreyen im Gebiete der Stadt Kasan wohnhaften Heidnischen Völkern des Tschermischen, Tschuwaschen und Wotiacken. Sammlung Russischer Geschichte, Bd. III., 4. Stück, StPbg, 382-409.
- MILLER, B. V. (1925), Ob armjanskikh nadpisjah v Bolgarah i Kazani: Izvestija Rossijskoj Akademii Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury 4, 65-80.
- MOKSIN, N. F. (1978), Mordovskie nazvanie Čuvašej: SFu 14, 281-282.
- MORAVCSIK, J. (1926-32), Ungarische Bibliographie der Turkologie und der orientalistisch-ungarischen Beziehungen 1914-1925: KCsA 2, 199-236.
- MORAVCSIK, Gy. (1958), Byzantinoturcica I. Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker, II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen. Berlin.
- MOSTAERT, A. (1942-44), Dictionnaire ordo I-III. Peking.
- MRS: Marijsko-russkij slovar', Ed. by Serebrennikov. Moskva, 1956.
- MSZFE: A magyar szókészlet finn-ugor elemei I-III. [Finno-Ugric elements in the Hungarian word-stock I-III]. Ed. by Gy. Lankó, K. Rédei and É. K. Sal. Budapest 1967-78.
- MUHAMETŠIN, Ju. G. (1977), Tatary-krjašeny. Moskva.
- Munk.: B. MUNKÁCSI (1896), A votják nyelv szótára (Lexicon Linguae Votiacorum). Budapest.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1884), Az altáji nyelvek számképzése II. A szamojéd nyelvág valódi számképzői. [The derivation of the Altaic [=Ural-Altaic] numerals II. The real derivativ suffixes of the numerals in the Samoyed branch]: Budenz Album. Budapest, 234-314.

- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1887-90), Csuvas nyelvészeti jegyzetek [Linguistic notes on Chuvash]: NyK 21, 1-44.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1887-90a), Ujabb adalékok a magyar nyelv török elemeihez [Further data on the Turkic elements in the Hungarian language]: NyK 21, 115-129.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1902), A samán csuvas neve [The Chuvash word for 'Shaman']: NyK 32, 483-484.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1903), A volgai bolgárokról [On the Volga Bulgarians]: Ethnografia 14, 66-76, 147-152, 261-265.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1905), Die Urheimat der Ungarn: KSz 6, 185-222.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1905a), "Hahn" als "Sänger" und "Schreier". Ungar, házasság 'verheiratet', Čuv. kil 'Haus': KSz 6, 182-104.
- MUNKÁCSI, B. (1926-32), Die heidnischen Namen der Wochentage bei den alten Völkern des Wolga-Uralgebietes: Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum 2, 42-64.
- MÜLLER, F.W.K. (1910), Uigurica II: APAW 1910, 3-110.
- Načatki hristianskogo učenija ili kratkaja svjaščennaja istorija i kratkij katehizis na čuvašskom jazyke s prisovokupleniem kratkih pravil dlja čtenija, Kazan' 1832.
- NADŽIP, É.N. (1961), Horezm. Muhabbat-name. Izdanie teksta, transkripcija, perevod i issledovanije É.N. Nadžipa. Moskva.
- NADŽIP, É.N. (1975), Tjurkojazyčnyj pamjatnik XIV veka "Gulistan" Sejfa Sarai i ego jazyk. Čast' vtoraja. Alma-Ata.
- NASYRI 1926: Neizdannye proizvedenija Kajuma Nasyrova i materialy k 100-letnemu jubileju so dnja roždenija. Ed. by A. Rahim, Kazan'.
- NÉMETH Gyula dr. (1913) jelentése az ufai csuvasok közt tett nyelvészeti tanulmányutjáról [Dr. J. Németh's report on his linguistic study tour among the Chuvash of Ufa]: KSz 14, 211-213.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1913a), A török-mongol a-féle hangok fejlődése a csuvasban [The development of the Turco-Mongolian a-sounds in the Chuvash]: NyK 42, 75-85.
- NÉMETH, J. (1913/14), Über den Ursprung des Wortes šaman und einige Bemerkungen zur türkisch-mongolischen Lautgeschichte:

- KSz 14, 240-249.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1914), Az ősjakut hangtan alapjai [An outline of proto-Yakut Phonetics]: NyK 43, 276-326, 448-476.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1915), A nagyszentmiklósi feliratokhoz [On the inscriptions of Nagyszentmiklós]: Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny 39, 495-497.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1915a), Bolgár-török jövevényszavainkhoz [On the proto-Bulgarian loan-words in Hungarian]: MNy 11, 316-318.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1915b), Die langen Vokale im Jakutischen: KSz 15, 150-164.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1916), Vannak-e arab eredetű bolgár-török szavaink? [Are there proto-Bulgarian loan-words of Arabian origin in the Hungarian?]: Magyar Nyelvőr 45, 213-215.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1921), Régi török jövevényszavaink és a turfáni emlékek [The ancient Turkic loan-words in Hungarian and the Turfan Documents]: Kőrösi Csoma-Archiv 1, 71-76.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1924), Húnok, bolgárok, magyarok [Huns, Bulgarians, Hungarians]: Budapesti Szemle 1924, 167-178.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1928), Az uráli és a török nyelvek ősi kapcsolata [The ancient relationship between the Uralian and Turkic languages]: NyK 47, 62-84.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1929), Szabírok és magyarok [Sabirs and Hungarians]: MNy 25, 81-88.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1930), A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása [The ethnogenesis of the conquering Hungarians]. Budapest.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1932), A nagyszentmiklósi kincs feliratai [The inscriptions of the treasure of Nagyszentmiklós]. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai. Budapest.
- NÉMETH, J. (1927), La provenance du nom bulgar: Symbola grammatica in honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski II, Cracoviae 1927, 217-222.
- NÉMETH, J. (1932a), Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklós. Mit zwei Anhängen: I. Die Sprache der Petschenegen und Komanen; II. Die Ungarische Kerschrift. BOH vol. II. Budapest-Leipzig.

- NÉMETH, J. (1932c), Die Herkunft der Namen Kobrat und Esperuch: Kőrösi Csoma-Archiv 2, 440-447.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1932d), A Kobrat és Eszperuch nevek eredete [The origin of the names Kobrat and Esperych]: MNy 28, 5-11.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1932e), A nagyszentmiklósi kincs feliratai [The inscriptions of the treasure of Nagyszentmiklós]: MNy 28, 65-85, 129-139.
- NÉMETH, J. (1933), Les inscriptions du trésor de Nagyszentmiklós [I]: Revue des Études Hongroises [8-] 9, 5-38.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1934), A törökség őskora [The prehistoric age of the Turks]: Emlékkönyv Berzeviczy Albert úrnak, a M. T. Akadémia elnökének, tiszteleti taggá választása harmincadik évfordulója alkalmából [A memorial volume on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the election as honorary member of Albert Berzeviczy, President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Budapest, 158-174.
- NÉMETH, J. (1934a), Les inscriptions du trésor de Nagyszentmiklós [II]: Revue des Études Hongroises 12, 126-136 + 1 map.
- NÉMETH, J. (1939), Zur Kenntnis des geschlossenen e im Türkischen: Kőrösi Csoma-Archiv 1 Erg.-Bd., 515-531.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1942), Török jövevényszók [Turkic Loan-Words]: Emlékkönyv Melich János hetvenedik születésnapjára [A memorial volume on the 70th birthday of János Melich], Budapest, 286-300.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1942a), A zárt e bolgár-török jövevényszavainkban [Close e in the proto-Bulgarian loan-words in Hungarian]: MNy 38, 1-11.
- NÉMETH, J. (1942-1947), Probleme der türkischen Urzeit. Ana-

- lecta Orientalia memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Kőrös dicata,
BOH V, Budapest, 57-102.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1943), Sólyom, karvaly [Falcon, sparrow-hawk]:
MNy 39, 99-104.
- NÉMETH, J. (1953), Wanderungen des Mongolischen Wortes
nőkür "Genosse": AOH 3, 1-23.
- NÉMETH, J. (1958), Zur Geschichte des Wortes tolmács 'Dol-
metscher': AOH 8, 1-8.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1962), Egy ótörök jövevényszó a magyarban az
állattenyésztés köréből. Kérődzik. [An Old Turkic loan-word
in Hungarian pertaining to animal husbandry. To Ruminant]:
MNy 58, 30-36.
- NÉMETH, J. (1964), La provenance du nom Bulgar: Onomastika
No. 28 (Winnipeg), 12.
- NÉMETH, J. (1964a), Zu den E-Lauten im Türkischen: Studia
Orientalia 28:14.
- NÉMETH, J. (1966a), Ungarische Stammesnamen bei den Basch-
kiren: ALH 16, 1-21.
- NÉMETH, J. (1966b), A Baskír földi magyar őshazáról [On the
original homeland of the Hungarians in the area of the
Bashkirs]: Élet és Tudomány 21, 596-599.
- NÉMETH, Gy. (1966c), Magyar törzsnevek a baskíroknál [Hun-
garian tribe-names among the Bashkirs]: NyK 68, 35-50.
- NÉMETH, J. (1970), Review on Egorov 1964: OLZ 65, cc.
172-173.
- NÉMETH, Ju. (1971), Vengerskie plemennye nazvanija u baškir:
Arheologija i Étnografija Baškirii 4, 294-262.
- NÉMETH, J. (1971a), The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-
-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe:
ALH 21, 1-52.
- NÉMETH, J. (1971b), Zoltán Gombocz et la théorie des mots
d'emprunts turks bulgares du hongrois: Études Finno-
-Ougriennes 8 (1971): Mélanges offerts à Aurélien Sauvageot
pour son soixante-quinzième anniversaire. Budapest 1972,
203-212.

- NÉMETH, Ju. (1976), K voprosu ob avarah: Turkologica. K 70-letiju A.N. Kononova, Ed. by S.G. Kljaštornyj, Ju.A. Petrosjan, É.R. Tenišev, Leningrad, 298-304.
- NIKOL'SKIJ, N.V. (1905), Étnografičeskij očerk Mil'koviča, pisatel'ja XVIII veka o čuvašah: IOAIÉ 22, 34-37.
- Opisanie živuščih v kazanskoj gubernii jazyčeskich narodov etc. sočinennoe G.F. Millerom, imp. AN professorom po vozvraščeenii ego v 1743 godu iz Kamčatskoj ékspedicii, StPbg, 1791.
- O PROISHOŽDENII 1957: O proishoždenii čuvaškogo naroda, Ed. by V.D. Dimitriev. Čeboksary 1957.
- ORLOVA, V.G. (1959), Istorija affrikat v russkom jazyke v svjazi s obrazovaniem russkikh narodnyh govorov, Moskva.
- P.A. (1908), Muzej v sele Anšuate Simbirskoj gub.: Istoričeskij Vestnik 1908, sentjabr, 982-986.
- PAASONEN, H. (1897), Die türkischen Lehnwörter im Mordwinischen: JSFOu 15.
- PAASONEN, H. (1902), Ungarisch-türkische Etymologien: KSz 3, 242-244.
- PAASONEN, H. (1902a), Votják-török szóegyeztetések [Votyak--Turkic concordance of words]: NyK 32, 257-270.
- PAASONEN, H. (1902b), Über die türkischen Lehnwörter im Ostjakischen: FUF 2, 81-137.
- PAASONEN, H. (1903), Die sogenannten Karataj-Mordwinen oder Karatajen: JSFOu 21, 1-51.
- PAASONEN, H. (1906), Der Name der Stadt Kasan: FUF 6, 111-114.
- PAASONEN, H. (1912-17), Beiträge zur finnischugrisch-samojedischen Lautgeschichte I-VI: KSz 13-17.
- PAASONEN, H. (1908), Csauvas szójegyzék [Chuvash word-list], Budapest.
- PAASONEN, H. (1913), A magyar nyelv régi török jövevény-szavai [Old Turkic loan-word in Hungarian]. Review on

- Gombocz 1912: NyK 42, 36-68.
- PAASONEN, H. (1953), Mordwinische Chrestomathie mit Glossar und grammatikalischem Abriss. 2. Aufl. Helsinki 1953.
(Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen IV.)
- PALLAS, P.S. (1771), Reise durch die verschiedene Provinzen des russischen Reichs I-III. SPbg, 1771-1776.
- PALLÓ, K.M. (1921), Reviews on Melich János, Bolgárok és szlávok [Bulgars and Slavs], Gombocz Zoltán, A bolgárok és a magyar húnmonda [The Bulgars and the Hungarian legend on the Huns], Németh Gyula, Török jövevényszavaink középső rétege [The medial layer of the Turkic loan-words in Hungarian] and Hóman Bálint, A székelyek eredete [The origin of the Székelys]: Kőrösi Csoma-Archiv 1, 169-173.
- PALLÓ, K.M. (1922), Toportyán [Wolf]: Kőrösi Csoma-Archiv 1, 234-236.
- PALLÓ, K.M. (1923), Kökörcsin [Pulsatilla]: NyK 46, 154-158.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1956), A magyar úr szó eredete [The etymology of the Hungarian word úr 'lord']: MNy 52, 157-167.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1956a), Review on Egorov 1954: NyK 61, 310-313.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1957), Űz, űsző [To chase, heifer]: MNy 53, 214-216.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1958a), Die sachlichen Grundlagen der Entlehnung des ungarischen Wortes Sárkány (Drache): Acta Ethnographica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 6, 435-440.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1959), Hungaro-Tschuwaschica: UAJb 31, 239-258.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1961), Zur Frage der tschuwaschischen v-Prothese: AOH 12, 33-44.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1961a), Die Vertretung ung. sz-(s) < türk. j- in den alten türkischen Lehnwörtern der ungarischen Sprache: UAJb 33, 128-135.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1961b), Zum Problem der ungarische Wortgruppe Égyház (igykő, igyfon); ügyűfa; ünnep, üdvöz, ünnepet ülni: ALH 11, 163-173.

- PALLÓ, M.K. (1962), Gyarló, gyarlandó, gyarlík [Frail, feeble]: MNy 58, 486-490.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1963), Telek 'Grund' telek 'Riemen': Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 38, 191-199.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1964), Ein alttürkischer Fachausdruck der Fischerei in den Ungarischen Urkunden: UAJb 35, 56-63.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1966), Jár [To walk]: NyK 68, 433-436.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1967), Zu den ältesten alttürkischen verbalen Entlehnungen der ungarischen Sprache: AOH 20, 111-118.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1968), "Az idő és társai"-hoz [A contribution to Ligeti 1966]: NyK 70, 174-180.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1969), Megjegyzések a TESz. három címszavához (győz-, búza, gyarmat) [Remarks on three items of TESz. (győz- 'win', búza 'wheat' and gyarmat)]: NyK 71, 137-141.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1969a), Nyargal [Galopp, ride]: MNy 65, 459-462.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1969b), Csipkeverő, kötélverő, marokverő [Lace-maker, rope-maker, sheaf-binder]: Magyar Nyelvőr 93, 282-285.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1969c), Váz 'madárijesztő' [Scare-crow]: Magyar Nyelvőr 93, 471-474.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1970), A Magyar Nyelvjárások Atlasza 78, gaz 'mauvaise herbe' térképéhez.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1970a), Die Herkunft des ung. Wortes harang 'Glocke': UAJb 42, 46-52.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1970b), Gyaláz [Abuse, revile]: MNy 66, 333-334.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1971), A Törő vezetéknév kapcsán [On the Hungarian surname Törő]: MNy 67, 213-216.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1971a), Die mittlere Stufe des tschuwaschischen Lautwandels d > ʁ > r (Zum Andenken an Nikolaj Ivanovič Ašmarin [1870-1933] anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstages): UAJb 43, 79-88.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1971b), Ung. gyúl "sich entzünden" und gyújt "anzünden" und ihr türkischer Hintergrund: Studia Turcica, BOH XVII Ed. by L. Ligeti, Budapest, 375-383.
- PALLÓ, M.K. (1972), Zur Etymologie des ungarischen Verbs

údül-: AOH 25, 405-412.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1972a), Verseny 'der Wetteifer' - verseng 'wetteifern': NyK 74, 197-199.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1972b), A MSzFE és a TESz árt, ölt és int szócikkeihez [A contribution to the items of MSzFE and TESz árt 'harm', ölt 'stich, put on a dress' and int 'wave, wink']: NyK 74, 427-433.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1972c), A ver¹ és a ver² [The Hungarian verbs ver¹ 'beat, strike' and ver² 'spin, twist']: MNy 68, 294-299.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1973), Tojik [To lay eggs]: MNy 69, 216-217.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1973a), Az ondó etimológiájához [To the etymology of ondó 'sperm, semen']: MNy 69, 480-481.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1974), A N. gyarat 'gerebenez' ~ gyárt ~ gyarapodik igék összefüggése [The interrelation of the verbs dial. gyarat- 'to hackle, card' ~ gyárt- 'to produce' ~ gyarapodik 'to grow, increase']: MNy 70, 206-209.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1964a), Ung. tor 'Gastmahl, Bewirtung' zu alt-türk. tod- 'sich sättigen': UAJb 46, 109-119.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1974b), Szemmel ver [Cast an evil eye]: Magyar Nyelvőr 98, 236-238.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1975), A talál magyarázatához [To the etymology of talál 'find']: MNy 71, 69-71.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1975a), Józan [Sober]: MNy 71, 458-459.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1976), Ocsúdik [Recover, awake]: MNy 72, 339-340.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1976a), Ténfereg [Hang about]: Magyar Nyelvőr 100, 339-341.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1976b), Honfoglalás előtti török igei átvételeink problémái [Problems of the Turkic verbal borrowings in Hungarian dating from the pre-Coquest times]. In: EEM, 230-234.

PALLÓ, M.K. (1978), Kajtat és kajtár [On the Hungarian kajtat 'rummage, scour' and kajtár 'bird of passage']: NyK 80, 166-169.

- PALLO, M.K. (1978a), Köpcös [Stumpy, squat]: MNy 74, 480.
- PALLO, M.K. (1978b), Ist ung. szán 'denken' eine Entlehnung aus dem Türkischen?: UAJb 50, 116-121.
- PALLO, M.K. (1978c), Sárkány [Dragon]: Magyar Nyelvőr 102, 472-474.
- PATRUBÁNY, L. (1881), Tör. arslan "oroszlán" [On the Turkic word arslan 'lion']: NyK 16, 459-460.
- PAVET DE COURTEILLE, M. (1870), Dictionnaire turk-oriental, destiné principalement à faciliter la lecture des ouvrages de Báber, d'Aboul Gâzi et de Mir-Ali-Chir-Nevâi, Paris.
- PELLIOT, P. (1930), Les mots mongols dans le Korye sã: JA 217 (1930), 253-266.
- PELLIOT, P. (1930a), Le nom turc des 'Mille sources' chez Hiuan-tsang: TP 27, 189-190.
- PELLIOT, P. (1931), Les formes turques et mongoles dans le nomenclature zoologique du Nuzhatu-'l-kulub: BSOAS 6, 555-860.
- PELLIOT, P. (1935), Review on G.J. Ramstedt, Die Palatalisation in den altaischen Sprachen: T'oung Pao 31, 176-178.
- PELLIOT, P. (1949), Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'or, (Oeuvres posthumes II), Paris.
- PETROV, N.P. (1967), Istorija čuvašskoj grafiki: UZČ 34, 100-116.
- PETROV, N.P. (1972), Zaroždenie i razvitie novoj čuvašskoj pis'mennosti: 100 let, 77-97.
- PETROV, N.P. (1976), Razvitie slovoobrazovatelnyh tipov s affiksom -šã (-šě, -ś) i popolnenie leksiki čuvašskogo literaturnogo jazyka v sovetskij period: ČJL 67, 3-43.
- POKORNY, J. (1959-69), Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bern-München.
- POPPE, N.N. (1924), Die tschuwassischen Lautgesetze [Besprechung von G.J. Ramstedt 1922]: AM 1, 775-782.
- POPPE, N.N. (1924a), K konsonantizmu altajskich jazykov: Doklady Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk 1924, 43-44.
- POPPE, N. (1925), Türkisch-tschuwasische vergleichende Studien:

- Islamica 1, 409-427.
- POPPE, N. (1926), Altaisch und Urtürkisch: UAJb 6, 94-121.
- POPPE, N. (1927), Die Nominalstammbildungssuffixe im Mongolischen: KSz 20, 89-126.
- POPPE, N. (1927a), Die türkischen Lehnwörter im Tschuwassischen: UJb 7, 151-167.
- POPPE, N. N. (1927b), Das mongolische Sprachmaterial einer Leidener Handschrift: Izvestija ANSSSR 1927, 1009-1040, 1251-1274.
- POPPE, N. N. (1927c), Čuvaši i ih sosedi. Čeboksary.
- POPPE, N. (1927d), Altaisch und Urtürkisch: UJb 6, 94-121.
- POPPE, N. N. (1930), Dagurskoe narečie. Leningrad.
- POPPE, N. N. (1938), Mongol' skij slovar' Mukkadimat al-Adab. Moskva-Leningrad.
- POPPE, N. (1953), Ein altes Kulturwort in den altaischen Sprachen: Studia Orientalia 19, 23-25.
- POPPE, N. N. (1957), The Mongolian Monuments in hP'ags-pa Script. Wiesbaden.
- POPPE, N. (1958), Einige Lautgesetze und ihre Bedeutung zur Frage der türkisch-mongolischen Sprachbeziehungen: UAJb 30, 93-97.
- POPPE, N. (1960), On Some Altaic Loanwords in Hungarian, Uralic and Altaic Series vol. 1, 139-147. American Studies in Uralic Linguistics, ed. by the Indiana University Comettee on Uralic Studies.
- POPPE, N. (1960a), Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. Teil I. Vergleichende Lautlehre. Wiesbaden.
- POPPE, N. (1962), Die Mongolischen Lehnwörter im Komanschen: Németh Armağani. Ed. by J. Eckmann, A. S. Levend, M. Mansuroğlu, Ankara, 331-340.
- POPPE, N. (1974), Zur Stellung des Tschuwaschischen: CAJ 18, 135-147.
- POPPE, N. (1977), On Chuvash-Mongolian Linguistic Contacts: JAOS 97, N^o2, 111-114.
- POPPE, N. (1977a), The Problem of Uralic and Altaic Affinity:

MSFOu 158, 221-225.

POPPE, N. Jr. (1971), Studies of Turkic loan words in Russian.
Wiesbaden.

PORFIR'EV, S. I. (1922), K istorii sbornika bolgarskih nadpisej:
Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 31:4,
41-44.

Povest' vremennyh let, t. I. Moskva-Leningrad 1950.

PRAVTO LUPAV, V. A. (1927), Šyru istorijě. Šupaškar.

PRITZAK, O. (1954), Die sogenannte Bulgarische Fürstenliste und
die Sprache der Protobulgaren: UAJb 26, 61-77, 184-239.

PRITZAK, O. (1955), Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und Sprache
der Protobulgaren. Wiesbaden.

PRITZAK, O. (1957a), Tschuwaschische Pluralsuffixe: Studia Al-
taica. Festschrift für Nikolaus Poppe zum 60 Geburtstag.
Wiesbaden, 137-155.

PRITSAK, O. (1959), Bolgaro-Tschuwaschica: UAJb 31, 274-314.

PRITSAK, O. (1959a), Das Kiptschakische: Fundamenta I. 74-87.

PRITSAK, O. (1959b), Käšgaris Angaben über die Sprache der
Bolgaren: ZDMG 109, 92-116.

PRITZAK, O. (1959c), Tschuwaschische Pluralsuffixe: Studia
Altaica. Wiesbaden, 137-138.

PRITSAK, O. (1964), Der "Rhotazismus" und "Lambdazismus",
UAJb 35, 337-349.

PRITZAK, O. (1960b), Die Herkunft des tschuwaschischen Fu-
turums: Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlan-
des 56, 141-153.

PRÖHLE, V. (1903.05), Baskır nyelvtanulmányok [Studies in
Bashkir linguistics]: KSz 4-6, 194-214, 228-271, 12-26.

- PROISHOŽDENIE 1948: Proishoždenie kazanskih tatar. Kazan'.
- PROTOKOLY 1911: Protokoly obščih sobranij i zasedanij soveta Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii pri Imp. Kazanskom universiteta za 1910 god. Kazan'.
- PSRL: Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej. Moskva.
- PSRL XXV: Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej, tom XXV. Moskva-Leningrad 1949.
- RADLOFF, W.W. (1882-83), Phonetik der nördlichen Türksprachen. Leipzig.
- RADLOV, W.W. (1888-1911), Versuch eines Wörterbuches der türk-Dialecte (Opyt slovarja tjurskikh narečii) I-IV. St. Petersburg.
- RAHIM, Ali (1923), Tatar ādābijati tarihi I:1-2. Kazan'.
- RAHIM, Ali (1929), O dvuh tatarskikh nadgrobnyh pamjatnikah XVII v.: Materialy po Ohrane, Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 3, 14-21.
- RAHIM, Ali (1930a), Bulgaro-tatarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki v Vjatskom krae: Mateialy po Ohrane, Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 4, 49-57.
- RAHIM, Ali (1930b), Tatarskie épigrafičeskie pamjatniki XVI v.: Trudy Obščestva Izučenija Tatarstana 1, 145-172.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1902), Bergtscheremissische Sprachstudien: MSFOu 17.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1905), Mogholica: JSFOu 23, 1-60.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1907), Über die Zahlwörter der altaischen Sprachen: JSFOu 24:1, 1-24.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1912), Zu den samojedisch-altaischen Berührung: FUF 12, 156-157.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1916), Zur mongolisch-türkischen Lautgeschichte III: KSz 16, 66-84.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1922-23), Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen: JSFOu 38, 3-34.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1932), Die Palatalisation in den altaischen Sprachen: Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B, 27, 239-251.
- RAMSTEDT, G.J. (1935), Kalmückisches Wörterbuch. Helsinki.

- RAMSTEDT, G. J. (1949-53), Studies in Korean Etymology I-II:
MSFOu 95:1-2.
- RAMSTEDT, G. J. (1952), Einführung in die altaische Sprach-
wissenschaft II, Formenlehre, bearbeitet und herausgegeben
von P. Aalto: MSFOu 104-2.
- RAMSTEDT, G. J. (1957), Einführung in die altaische Sprach-
wissenschaft I, Lautlehre, bearbeitet und herausgegeben
von P. Aalto: MSFOu 104:1.
- RAMSTEDT, G. J. (1966), Einführung in die altaische Sprach-
wissenschaft III, Register, zusammengestellt von P. Aalto:
MSFOu 104:3.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1920), Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter im
Tscheremissischen: MSFOu 48.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1923), Die tatarischen Lehnwörter im Tschere-
remissischen: MSFOu 50.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1924), Tscheremissische zeit- und massbestim-
mungen: MSFOu 52, 250-256.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1928), Osttscher, kəzər-pijambar: MSFOu 58,
214-216.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1931-34), Magy. gyűlöli 'hassen': NyK 48,
161-162.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1932), Beiträge zur Frage der Türkischen Vokal-
harmonie: JSFOu 45:3, 1-10.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1933), Tscheremissische u. a. Etymologien:
MSFOu 67, 360-364.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1935), Türkische Lehnwörter in den permischen
Sprachen und im Tscheremissischen: FUF 23, 103-107.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1936), Tscher. jamdar 'klar; Flasche' und
etwas von der Geschichte des Glases und des Bernsteins:
NyK 50, 386-389.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1937), Neue tscheremissische und tschuwassische
Wörterbücher nebst Etymologien auf Grund derselben: FUF
24 Anz., 45-54.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1937a), Über die langen Vokale der türkischen
Lehnwörter im Ungarischen: FUF 24, 246-255.

- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939), Spuren vom altaischen anl. n in den türkischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen: UAJb 19, 99-101.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939a), Nochmals über ung. könyv "buch" und mord. koňov "papier": FUF 26, 76-79.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939b), Sprachliche Miszellen: UJb 19, 99-103.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939c), Ung. kíván: FUF 26, 215-216.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939d), Wortgeschichtliches zu den Sprachen der Wolga-Völker: FUF 26, 125-143.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1939e), Aus der türkischen Formenlehre: JSFOu 50:7, 1-10.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1946), Volgan bolgaarien vaikutuksesta pohjoismaihin [Über den Einfluss der Wolga-Bolgaren auf die nordischen Länder]: Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 25-26, 194-205.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1946a), Der Wolga-bolgarische Einfluss im Westen im Lichte der Wortgeschichte: FUF 29, 190-201.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1946b), Etymologia lisiä [Etymologische Beiträge. Finn. tundra, lipsu, kuusama.]: Virittäjä 50, 387-391.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1949), Materialen zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen: Studia Orientalia 15.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1949a), Gebräuche und Volksdichtung der Tschuwasen. Gesammelt von Heikki Paasonen. Hrsg. von Eino Karahka and Martti Räsänen: MSFOu 94.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1950), Beiträge zu den altaisch-slavischen Berührungen: MSFOu 98, 125-131.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1950a), Regenbogen - Himmelsbrücke: Studia Orientalia 14:1.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1950b), Etymologia lisiä 7-8. [Etymologische Beiträge 7-8. Tscher. βuj und βoiānd'žā; kamâsâr.]: Virittäjä 54, 150-151.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1951), Neuere Forschungen über altaisch-slavisches Berührungen: Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 20, 446-450.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1952), Etymologia lisiä 9-14. [Etymologische Beiträge 9-14. Finn. muura/i/n; Bezeichnungen für Mes-

- sing in einigen Wolga-Sprachen; tscher. šol; tscher. kara, kārā; Bezeichnungen für Quecksilber besonders im Tscheremissischen; Beiträge zur Besteuerung der Wolga-Völker und zu den Namen von Eichhörnchen und Kopeke.]: Virittäjä 56, 175-179.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1953), Contributions au classement des langues turques: RO 17, 92-104.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1953a), Die russ. Ortsnamen. [Čeboksary, Samára, Barnaul]: Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 22, 152-153.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1953b), Uralaltaische Forschungen. I. Die uralaltaische Urheimat im Lichte der Wortforschung und der Archäologie: UAJb 25, 19-27.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1955), Uralaltaische Wortforschungen: Studia Orientalia 18:3.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1957), Materialen zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen: Studia Orientalia 21.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1959), Über die Lederarbeitung der ural-altäischen Völker: UAJb 31, 315-316.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1960), Review on Pritzak 1955: Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 29, 230-231.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1960a), Türkische Miszellen: Studia Orientalia 25:1.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1960b), Vähän omasta ja omaisuudesta [Etwas über oma 'eigen' und omaisuus 'Eigentum']: UAJb 31, 315-316.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1962), Die chakassischen i-Laute: AOH 15, 245-247.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1962a), Die Reflexiva u < ⁺bu im Türkischen: MSFOu 125, 441-442.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1963), Über die ural-altäische Sprachverwandtschaft: Sitzungsberichte der Finnischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1963, 161-172.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. (1969), Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen I-II. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 17, 1-2. Helsinki 1969-71.

RĀSĀNEN see also under RĴASJANEN

RÁSONYI, L. (1934), Török jövevényszavainkhoz. Szárny. [On the Turkic loan-words in Hungarian. "Wing"]: MNy 30, 158-160.

RÁSONYI, L. (1935-38), Ungarische Bibliographie der Turkologie und der orientalistisch-ungarischen Beziehungen 1926-1934: KCsA Ergb., 1-68.

RÁSONYI, L. (1941-43), Török adatok a Magyar Etymológiai Szótárhoz [Turkic data to the Etymological Dictionary of the Hungarian Language]: NyK 51, 98-115, 280-306.

RÁSONYI, L. (1966), Macarca "Gyermek" Kelimesi ve "Ermyak" Adı : Reşid Rahmeti Arat İçin. Türk Kültürünü Arastırma Enstitüsü Yayınları 19, Seri: 1 - Sayı: A 2, 382-387.

RASSADIN, V.I. (1971), Fonetika i leksika tofalarskogo jazyka. Ulan-Ude.

RAUN, A. (1957), The Chuvash Borrowings in Zyrian: JAOS 77, 40-45.

RAVILA, P. (1929), Einige tatarische Lehnwörter des Mordwinischen: FUF 21, 106-107.

RÉDEI, K. (1968), A permi nyelvek első szótagi magánhangzóinak a történetéhez [To the history of the vowels of the first syllable in the Permian languages]: NyK 70, 35-45.

RÉDEI, K. (1969), Gibt es sprachliche Spuren der vorungarisch-permischen Beziehungen?: ALH 19, 321-334.

RÉDEI, K. (1970), Die syrjänischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen. Budapest.

RÉDEI, K. (1970a), Kengyel [Hungarian kengyel 'stirrup']: MNy 64, 226-227.

RÉDEI, K. --A. RÓNA-TAS (1972), A permi nyelvek ősspermi kori bolgár-török jövevényszavai [Bulgar-Turkic loan-words in proto-Permian]: NyK 74, 281-298.

RÉDEI, K. --A. RÓNA-TAS (1975), A bolgár-török--permi érintkezés néhány kérdése [On some problems of Bulgar-Turkic--Permian contacts]: NyK 77, 31-44.

RÉDEI, K. --A. RÓNA-TAS (1976), Ob odnom agrikul'turnom termine v jazykah Srednego Povol'z'ja: Turcologica. K. semi-

desjatiletiju akademika A.N. Kononova, Leningrad 1976, 142-145.

REDHOUSE: New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary, Istanbul 1974.

REGULY 1881: Két csuvas mēse [Two Chuvash Tales]. Edited from A. Reguly's collection by J. Budenz: NyK 16, 157-164.

RJASJANEN, M. (1955), Materialy po istoričeskoj fonetike tjurskih jazykov. Moskva.

RMS: Russko-marijsko slovar'. Moskva 1966.

Rog.: N. ROGOV (1869), Permjacko-russkij i russko-permjackij slovar'. Spb.

ROMANOV, N. R. (1962), Čuvašskij narodnyj kalendar': UZČ 21, 237-259.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1961), A Dariganga Vocabulary: AOH 13, 147-174.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1965), Review on Materialy po čuvašskoj dialektologii. Vyp. I, Čeboksary 1960, Vyp. II, Čeboksary 1963: AOH 18, 385-387.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1966), Beszámoló csuvas tanulmányutamról [Report on my study-tour to Chuvashia]: IOK 23 (1966), 325-334.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1967), Report on a Fieldwork in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic: Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Newsletter 2, 15-16.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1967a), A magyar nyelv régi török elemei és a csuvas nyelvtörténet néhány kérdése [Old Turkic elements in Hungarian and some problems of Chuvash historical phonology]: A magyar nyelv története és rendszere. A debreceni nemzetközi nyelvészkongresszus előadásai [History and system of the Hungarian language. Papers delivered at the International Conference of Linguists, held in Debrecen]: Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 58. Budapest 1967, 172-177.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1970), Some problems of Ancient Turkic: Acta Orientalia Havniensis 32, 209-228.

RÓNA-TAS, A. (1970a), Az altaji nyelvrokonság vizsgálatának alapjai [The Outlines of the Researches on Altaic Linguistic Affinity].

(Unpublished).

RONA-TAS, A. (1971), On the Chuvash Guttural Stops in the Final Position: Studia Turcica, BOH XVII. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 389-399.

RONA-TAS, A. (1971a), Review on Räsänen 1969: NyK 73, 466-470.

RONA-TAS, A. (1971-72), Középmongol eredetű jövevéyszavak a csuvasban I. [Loan-words of Middle Mongolian origin in Csuvasch I.]: Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae, Sectio Ethnographia et Linguistica - Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány 15-16, 77-88.

RONA-TAS, A. (1972), Dream, Magic Power and Divination in the Altaic World: AOH 25, 227-236.

RONA-TAS, A. (1973), Did the Proto-Altaic People Know the Stirrup?: Studia Mongolica 1973:13, 169-171.

RONA-TAS, A. (1973-74), Középmongol eredetű jövevéyszavak a csuvasban II. [Loan-words of Middle Mongolian origin in Chuvash II.]: Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae, Sectio Ethnographia et Linguistica - Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány 17-18, 125-141.

RONA-TAS, A. (1974), Tocharische Elemente in den Altaischen Sprachen?: Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker. Hrsg. G. Hazai, P. Zieme. Berlin, 499-504.

RONA-TAS, A. (1974a), Обščее наследие или заимствования? (K probleme rodstva altajskih jazykov): VJa 1974:2, 31-45.

RONA-TAS, A. (1974b), Ob odnom zaимstvomannom srednemongol'skom slove v marijskom jazyke: Issledovanija po vostočnyj filologii. K semidesjatiletiju professor G.D. Sanžeeva, Moskva 1974, 230-234.

RONA-TAS, A. (1975), The Altaic Theory and the History of a Middle Mongolian Loan Word in Chuvash: Researches in Altaic Languages. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 201-211.

RONA-TAS, A. (1975a), Towards a New Edition of the Volga Bulgarian Inscriptions: Turcica 5, 14-18.

RONA-TAS, A. (1975b), Some Problems of Uralic Vocalism from

- an Altaist's Point of View: CTIFU, pars I. Tallin 1975, 139-143.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1975c), Böz in the Altaic World: Altorientalische Forschungen III, 155-163.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1975d), A volgai bolgárok fővárosában [In the capital of the Volga Bulgars]: Keletkutatás 1974. Budapest 1975, 139-150.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1976), Some Volga Bulgarian Words in the Volga Kipchak Languages: Hungaro-Turcica, Studies in Honour of Julius Németh. Ed. by Gy. Káldy-Nagy, Budapest, 169-175.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1976a), A Volga Bulgarian inscription from 1307: AOH 30, 153-186.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1976b), On the Meaning of "Altaic": Tractata Altaica. Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata. Ed by W. Heissig, J.R. Krueger, F.J. Oinas, E. Schütz. Wiesbaden, 549-556.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1976c), A Runic Inscription in the Kujbyšev Region: AOH 30, 267-271.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1977), A magyar--bolgár--török érintkezés jellege [The character of the Hungarian--Bulgar-Turkish contacts]: Magyar Östörténeti Tanulmányok. Ed. by A. Bartha, K. Czeglédy and A. Róna-Tas. Budapest, 267-275.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1978), An Unpublished Chuvash Wordlist in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences: Oriental Studies 2. Jubilee Volume of the Oriental Collection 1951-1976, 159-173.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1978a), A nyelvrokonság [The linguistic relationship]. Budapest.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1978b), Bevezetés a csuvas nyelv ismeretébe [An introduction to the Chuvash language]. Budapest.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1979), Mongolo-vengerskie jazykovye paralellii istoričeskij fon mongolo-tjurskih svjazej: Olon ulsyn mongolč érdemtnyj III ih hural, III Bot'. Ulaan-baatar 1979, 245-252.
- RÓNA-TAS, A. (1979a), Some Recent publications on Chuvash:

AOH 33, 349-362.

RONA-TAS, A. (1980a), On the Earliest Samoyed-Turkish Contacts: Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum III. Turku 1980, 377-385.

RONA-TAS, A. --S. FODOR (1973), Epigraphica Bulgarica. A volgai bolgár-török feliratok: Studia Uralo-Altaica I. Szeged.

RUDNICKIJ, J. B. (1962), An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. Winnipeg.

Russko-čuvašskij slovar', Ed. by I. A. Andreev, N. P. Petrov. Moskva 1971.

RYBUŠKIN, N. (1833), Poezdka v Bolgary i Biljarsk: Zavolžskij Muravej 1833:4, Kazan'.

RYČKOV, N. (1770), Žurnal ili dnevnje zapiski putešestvija po raznym provincijam Rossijskogo gosudarstva v 1769 i 1770 gg. SPbg.

SAINT-MARTIN (1831), Note sur les inscriptions arméniennes de Bolghari: JA 1831, 503-506.

ŠAHMATOV, A. A. (1918), Zametka o jazyke volžskih bolgar: Sbornik Muzeja Antropologii i Étnografii 5, 395-397.

SAMMALLAHTI, P. (1979), Über die Laut- und Morphemstruktur der uralischen Grundsprache: FUF 43, 22-66.

SAMOJLOVIČ, A. N. (1918), Turun-Tudun. Ešče primer turko-bulgarskogo rotacizma: Sbornik Muzeja Antropologii i Étnografii 5, 398-400.

SAMOJLOVIČ, A. N. (1922), Nekotorye dopolnenija k klassifikacii tureckih jazykov. Petrograd.

SAMOJLOVIČ, A. N. (1927), Neskol'ko popravok k izdaniju i perevodu jarlykov Tohtamyš-hana: Izvestija Tavričeskogo obščestva istorii, arheologii i étnografii, 1, 58.

SAUVAGEOT, A. (1929), Recherches sur le vocabulaire des langues ouralo-altaïques. Budapest.

SAVEL'EV, P. S. (1852), Opisanie dvuh metalličeskikh zerkal s arabskimi nadpisjami, najdennyh bliz razvalin Bulgara: Zapiski Imperatorskogo Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 4, 72-78.

ŠČERBAK, A. M. (1961), Nazvanija domašnih i dikih životnyh v

- tjurskih jazykah: Istoričeskoe razvitie leksiki tjurskih jazykov, Moskva, 82-172.
- ŠČERBAK, A. M. (1970), Sravnitel'naja fonetika tjurkskih jazykov, Leningrad.
- SCHERNER, B. (1977), Arabische und neupersische Lehnwörter im Tschuwaschischen, Wiesbaden.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. A. (1956), K voprosu o dejstvitel'nyh vzaimo-otnošenijah meždu čuvašskim, bulgarskim i tatarskim jazykami: UZČ 14, 63-75.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. A. (1956a), Problema substrata: Dokl. i Soobšč. Instituta Jazykoznanija 1956:9, 33-56.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. (1957), Zur Geschichte der a-Laute im Tscheremissischen und Tschuwassischen: UAJb 29, 224-230.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. A. (1957a), Proišhoždenie čuvaš po dannym jazyka: O proišhoždenii čuvašskogo.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. A. (1972), Ešče raz o zamene šipjaščih svistjaščih v jazyke Besermjan: SFu 39-45.
- SEREBRENNIKOV, B. A. (1975), Prajazyk kak neobhodimaja model': CQIFU, Budapest, 61-69.
- SERGEEV, L. P. (1968), Dialektologičeskij slovar' čuvašskogo jazyka, Čeboksary.
- SERGEEV, L. P. (1970), O pamjatnikah čuvašskoj pis'mennosti XVIII veka: UZČ 46, 228-263.
- SERGEEV, L. P. (1972), O dojakovlevskom periode čuvašskoj pis'mennosti: 100 let, 47-76.
- SETAROV, D. S. (1970), Tjurkizmy v russkih nazvanijah ptic: ST 1970:2, 86-94.
- SEVORTJAN, É. V. (1971), O soderžanii termina "obščetjurkskij": ST 1971:2, 3-12.
- SEVORTJAN, É. V. (1973), K istočnikam i metodam prattjurkskoj rekonstrukcij: Voprosy jazykoznanija 1973:2, 35-45.
- SEVORTJAN, É. V. (1974), Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih jazykov (Obščetjurkskie i meztjurkskie osnovy na glasnye), Moskva.
- SEVORTJAN, É. V. (1978), Étimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskih ja-

- zykov (Obščetjurkskie i meztjurkskie osnovy na bukvu "B").
Moskva.
- SHINOBU IWAMURA (1961), The Zirni Manuscript. Kyoto.
- SINOR, D. (1946-47), Autour d'une migration de peuples au V^e
siècle: JA 1946-47, 1-78.
- SINOR, D. (1964), Yul: Studia Orientalia 28:7.
- SINOR, D. (1965), Notes on the Equine Terminology of the Altaic
Peoples: CAJ 10, 307-315.
- SINOR, D. (1977), Altaica and Uralica: Studies in Finno-Ugric
Linguistics in Honor of Alo Raun. Bloomington, 319-331.
- SIROTKIN, M. Ja. (1961), Čuvaško-russkij slovar'. Moskva.
- SIROTKIN, M. Ja. (1967), Očerki dorevoljucionnoj čuvaškoj lite-
ratury. Čeboksary.
- SKES: Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja I-V. Helsinki 1955-
-1975.
- ŠKORPIL, H. i K. (1888), Pametnici iz bălgarsko. Sofija.
- ŠKORPIL, K. i H. (1901), Părvata bălgarska stolica do Aboba,
Godišen otčet na Varnenskata dăržavna măžka gimnazija
za 1900-1901. Varna 1901, 3-18.
- ŠKORPIL, K. (1930), Nadpisi ot părvoto bălgarsko carstvo v
Černomorskata oblast: Bizantinoslavica 2, 189-195.
- SMIRNOV, A. P. (1951), Volžskie bulgary. Moskva.
- SMOLIN, V. K. (1926a), K izučeniju kazanskogo kraja: Vestnik
Naučnogo Obščestva Tatarovedenija 2, 141-142.
- SMOLIN, V. K. (1926b), Po razvilinam drevnego Bulgara. Kazan'.
- SOBOLEVSKIJ, A. M. (1929), Zapiska Ibn Fadlana: Doklady
ANSSSR, 223-227.
- Sočinenija prinadležaščie k grammatike Čuvaškogo jazyka. Com-
piled under the guidance of V. G. Pucek-Grigorovič. StPbg
1769. 2nd edition 1775.
- SOLOV'EV, J. T. (1884), O mogil'nyh pamjatnikah bliz sela Russk.
Kirmeni v Mamadyšskom uezde Kazanskoj gub. Trudy IV. Ar-
heologičeskogo s'ezda v Rossi. Byvšago v Kazani s 31 ljulja

- po 18 avgusta 1877 g. I. Kazan' 1884, XLI-XLII.
- SOVREMENNYJ 1960: Sovremennyy marijskij jazyk. Fonetika.
Yoškar-Ola, 1960.
- ŠPILEVSKIJ, S.M. (1877), Drevnie goroda i drugie bolgarsko-
-tatarskie pamjatniki v kazanskoj gubernii. Kazan'.
- ŠPILEVSKIJ, S.M. (1884), O zadačah dejatelnosti Kazanskogo
Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii. Kazan'.
- Sravnitel'nye slovari 1787-89: Sravnitel'nye slovari vseh jazykov.
Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa. Compiled
by P.S. Pallas. StPbg, 1787-89.
- Sravnitel'nyj slovar' vseh jazykov i narečij po azbučnomu raspo-
ložennju I-IV. Published by F.I. Jankovič de Mirievo,
StPbg, 1790-91.
- SSKD: Sravnitel'nyj slovar' komi-zyrjanskih dialektov. Syktyvkar
1961.
- STEINITZ, W. (1961), Einige türkische Lehnwörter im Ostjaki-
schen: AOH 12, 179-181.
- STEINITZ, W. (1962), Etymologische Beiträge (II.) Zu den syr-
jänischen Lehnwörtern des Obiugrischen: ALH 12, 247-254.
- STEINITZ, W. (1965), Etymologische Beiträge (IV.) Tatarische
Lehnwörter im Ostjakischen und Wogulischen: ALH 15,
85-96.
- [STO] 100 LET: 100 let novej čuvašskoj pis'mennosti. Sbornik
statej. Čeboksary 1972.
- STRAHLENBERG, Ph.J. von (1730), Das Nord- und Ostliche
Theil von Europa und Asia. Stockholm 1730. Reprinted in
Studia Uralo-Altaica 8. With an introduction by J.R. Krueger.
Szeged 1975.
- TAMBOVCEV, L.M. (1927), Ob odnom arheologičeskom pamjatnike
bolgarskoj kul'tury: Zapiski Tetjuškogo Muzeja 1, 14-16.
- TARAKANOV, I.V. (1975), Istorija izučenija udmurtsko-tjurkskih
jazykovyh kontaktov: SFu 11, 135-141.
- TARAKANOV, I.V. (1977), Tjurkizmy v udmurtskih dialektah po
pis'mennym pamjatnikam XVIII veka: Voprosy Udmurtskoj
Dialektologii. Iževsk, 85-100.

- TARAMA SÖZLÜĞÜ: Tarama Sözlüğü, I-VII. Ankara 1963-1974.
- TARZIMANOV, F. V. (1928), Mogil' niki bliz dereven' Saryj Baran i Tašbil' ge: Vestnik Naučnogo Obščestva Tatarovedenija 8, 175-177.
- TEKIN, T. (1969), Zetacism and Sigmatism in Proto-Turcic: AOH 22, 51-80.
- TEKIN, T. (1975), Further Evidence for "Zetacism" and "Sigmatism": Researches in Altaic Languages, BOH 20. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest, 275-284.
- TEKIN, T. (1979), Once more Zetacism and Sigmatism: CAJ 23, 118-137.
- TENIŠEV, É. R. (1971), K ponjatiju "obščetjurskoe sostojanie": ST 1971:2, 13-16.
- TENIŠEV, É. R. (1973), Tjurkskaja istoričeskaja dialektologija i Mahmud Kašgarskij: ST 1973:6, 54-61.
- TENIŠEV, É. R. (1976), Otraženie dialektov v tjurkskih runičeskikh i ujugurskih pamjatnikah: ST 1976:1, 27-33.
- TENIŠEV, É. R. (1977), O tjurkizmah v sel'kupskom jazyke: MSFOu 158, 235-239.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1968), O smesanii čuvaši i besermjane v pismennyh istočnikah: UZČ 40, 177-187.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1970), Jazyk besermjan. Moskva.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1970a), Mena besermjanskih šipjaščih i svistjaščih affrikat palatal'nymi soglasnymi: SFu 1970:1, 63-66.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1971), Podmena šipjaščih zvukov svistjaščimi v jazykah Volgo-kam'ja: SFu 1971:1, 5-12.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1972), Ob odnom volžsko-kamskom arealnom javlenii: ST 1972:3, 35-40.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1972a), Iz patronomii karinskih tatar: ST 1972:5, 53-57.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1972b), Tjurkizmy v besermjanskoj terminologii rodstva: VSFUJa, Saransk, 28.
- TEPLJAŠINA, T. I. (1975), Drevnebulgarskie substratnye javlenija v jazyke besermjan: CTIFU, 562-567.
- TESZ: A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára I-III. [The

historico-etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language I-III]. Ed. by L. Benkő. Budapest 1967-76.

TEZISY 1956: Tezisy dokladov na Konferencii po Arheologii, Drevnoj Srednevekovoj Istorii Narodov Povol'ža v Kazani v 1956. Moskva.

THOMSEN, V. (1896), Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées: MSFOu 5.

THOMSEN, K. (1962), Zur wolgalbolgarischen Epigraphie: Acta Orientalia Havniae 26:3-4, 189-192.

TIETZE, A. (1955), Griechische Lehnwörter im anatolischen Türkisch: Oriens 8, 205-257.

TODAEVA, B. H. (1961), Dunsjanskij jazyk. Moskva.

TODAEVA, B. H. (1964), Baoan'skij jazyk. Moskva.

TOGAN, A. Z. V. (1939), Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, Leipzig.
(Reprinted in 1966).

TOIVONEN, Y. H. (1928), Zur Geschichte der finnisch-ugrischen inlautenden affrikaten: FUF 19, 1-270.

TOIVONEN, Y. H. (1943-44), Türkische Lehnwörter im Ostjasischen: JSFOu 52, 1-20.

TOMASCHEK, v. W. (1872), Review on R. Roesler, Romänische Studien: Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien 23, 141-157.

TOMASCHEK, v. W. (1877), Review on J. Jireček, Geschichte der Bulgaren: Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien 28, 674-686.

TRIFONOV, Ju. (1923), Kām vāprosa za starobālgarskata boljartvo: Spisanie na BAN 26, 1-70.

TRS 1966: Tatarsko-russkij slovar'. Moskva 1966.

TRUBETZKOY, N. S. (1939), Gedanken über das Indogermanenproblem: Acta Linguistica Copenhagensis 1, 81-89.

TTDS: Tatar telenenj dialektologik stızlege. Ed. by L. T. Mahmutova. Kazan' 1969.

TUMAŠEVA, D. G. (1961), Könbatıs Seber tatarları tele (Jazyk zapadnosibirskih tatar). Kazan'.

TUMAŠEVA, D. G. (1977), Dialekty sibirskih tatar. Kazan'.

UMTSZ: Uj Magyar Tájszótár, I. A-D A New Hungarian Dialectal Dictio-

nary]. Budapest 1979.

UOTILA, T.E. (1933), Zur Geschichte des Konsonantismus in den permischen Sprachen: MSFOu 65.

UOTILA, T.E. (1933a), Wortgeschichtliches: MSFOu 67, 398-401.

UOTILA, T.E. (1935), Wortgeschichtliches: FUF 23, 97-102.

UOTILA, T.E. (1938), Syrjänliche Chrestomathie mit grammatischem Abriss und etymologischem Wörterverzeichnis, Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen VI. Helsinki 1938.

UOTILA, T.E. (1939-40), Etymologische Beiträge: FUF 26, 144-191.

UOTILA, T.E. (1943-44), Lehnwörter des Permischen: JSFOu 52/5, 1-10.

URAY, G. (1960), A Bibliography of the Works of Prof. Németh: AOII 11, 11-28.

URS1.: Udmurtsko-russkij slovar'. Ed by V.M. Vahrušev, etc. Moskva 1948.

USPENSKIJ, F. (1905), Nadpisi starobalgarskija: Izvestija Russkago arheologičeskago instituta v Konstantinopole, Sofija 4-16 (1899-1912) 10, 173-249.

VÁSÁRY, I. (1975), The Hungarians or Možars and the Meščers/Mišers of the Middle Volga Region: Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 1, 237-275.

VASILEVIČ, G.M. (1958), Évenkijsko-russkij slovar'. Moskva.

VASMER, R. (1925), Beiträge zur muhamedanischen Münzkunde II. Über die Münzen der Wolga-Bulgaren: Numismatische Zeitschrift 58, 63-84.

VASMER, M. (1953-58), Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-III. Heidelberg.

VASMER see also under FASMER.

VEL'JAMINOV-ZERNOV, V.V. (1859), Pamjatnik s arabo-tatarskuju nadpis'ju v Baškirii: Zapiski Imp. Arheologičeskogo Obščestva 13, 257-284.

VENEDIKOV, I. (1950), Trois inscriptions protobulgares: Razkopki

- i proučvanija 4, 167-185.
- VERBICKIJ, V. (1884), Slovar' altajskago i aladagskago narečij tjurkskago jazyka. Kazan.
- VIŠNEVSKIJ, V. P. (1836), Načertanie pravil čuvaškago jazyka i slovar', sostavlennye dlja duhovnyh učilišč Kazanskoj éparhii, Kazan', 1836.
- VOPROSY 1971: Voprosy étnogeneza tjurkojazyčnyh narodov srednego Povolž'ja. Kazan'.
- VOROB'EV, N. I. (1929), O bolgaro-tatarskih nadgrobnym kamnjam Mamadyškago kantona TASSR: Materialy po Ochrane, Remontu i Restavracii Pamjatnikov TASSR 3, 11-13.
- VY SOCKIJ, N. F. (1908), Neskol'ko slov o drevnostjah volžskoj Bolgarii: Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii, Istorii i Étnografii 24:4, 340-351 + I-X, t.
- VY SOCKIJ, N. F. (1921), Neskol'ko slov o bolgarah i bolgarskoj kul'ture: Kazanskij Muzejnyj Vestnik: 1-2 (1921), 57-66.
- WEIERS, M. (1972), Ein arabisch-mongolischer Wörterspiegel aus der Bibliotheca Corsini in Rom: ZAS 6, 7-61.
- Wichm.: WICHMANN, Y. (1954), Wotjakische Chrestomathie mit glossar. Anhang: grammatikalischer Abriss von D. R. Fuchs. 2, ergänzte Aufl. Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen II. Helsinki.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1903), Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter in den permischen Sprachen: MSFOu 21.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1907), Zum Stufenwechsel im Ungarischen: FUF 7, 31-53.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1911), Zur geschichte der finnisch-ugrischen anlautenden Affrikaten, bes. im Ungarischen und im Finnischen: FUF 11, 173-289.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1912), Etymologisches aus den permischen Sprachen: FUF 12, 128-138.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1914), Etymologisches aus den permischen Sprachen: FUF 14, 81-120.
- WICHMANN, Y. (1923-24), Die türkischen Lehnwörter im tschere-missischen (Review on Räsänen 1920 and 1923): FUF 16,

Anz. 32-53.

Wied.: WIEDEMANN, F. J. (1880), Syrjānisch-deutsches Wörterbuch nebst einem wotjakisch-deutschen und einem deutschen Register, St. Petersburg.

WINTER, W. (1963), Tocharians and Turks. In: Aspects of Altaic Civilization. Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series 23. Ed. By D. Sinor. Bloomington, 239-251.

WUo.: Syrjānischer Wortschatz nebst Hauptzügen der Formenlehre aufgezeichnet von Y. Wichmann, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von T. E. Uotila, Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae VII, Helsinki 1942.

YUGNAKI: Edib Ahmed B. Mahmud Yūkneki, Atabetü'l-Hakayik. Ed. by R. Arat. Istanbul 1951.

ZÄKIEV, M. Z. (1977), Tatar halqı telenen barlıkka kılde. Kazan'. Zapiski Aleksandry Fuks o čuvašah i čeremisah Kazanskoj Gubernii, 1840.

ZLATARSKI, V. N. (1918-1927), Istorija na bālgarskata dāržava prez srednite vekove I 1, Sofija 1918; I 2, Sofija 1927.

ZOLOTNICKIJ, N. I. (1875), Kornevoj čuvašsko-russkij slovar', Kazan'.

ZOLOTNICKIJ, N. I. (1884), Lingvističeskaja zametka o nazvanijah Bulgar, Biljar i Morkvašy. Kazan'.

Abbreviations

ABAW	Abhandlungen der (Berliner) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin
AÉB	Arheologia i étnografia Baškirii, Ufa
ALH	Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
AM	Asia Major
AOH	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
BOH	Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London
CAJ	Central Asiatic Journal
CQIFU	Congressus Quartus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Budapest 1975.
CTIFU	Congressus Tertius Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Tallinn 1970.
CJL	Čuvašskij jazyk i literatura, Čeboksary
FUF	Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen, Helsinki
IOAIÉ	Izvestija Obščestva Arheologii i Étnografii pri Kazanskom Universitete
IOK	Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. Osztályának Közleményei, Budapest
JA	Journal asiatique, Paris
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society

JSFOu	Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne, Helsinki
KSz	Keleti Szemle, Budapest
MIA	Materialy i issledovanija po arheologii SSR, Moskva-Leningrad
MNy	Magyar Nyelv, Budapest
MSFOu	Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne, Helsinki
NyK	Nyelvtudományi Közlemények, Budapest
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, Berlin
RO	Rocznik Orientalistyczny, Warszawa
SFu	Sovetskoe finnougrovedenie
ST	Sovetskoe tjurkologija, Baku
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin
TP	T'oung Pao, Leiden
UAJb	Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, Wiesbaden
UJb	Ungarische Jahrbücher, Berlin
UZČ	Naučno-issledovatel'skij Institut pri Sovete Ministrov Čuvašskoj ASSR. Učenyje zapiski
Vja	Voprosy Jazykoznanija, Moskva
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutsche Morgenländischen Ge- sellschaft



B 97721

Készült: a Cs. m. ZÖLDFRI sokszorosító üzemében
Felelős vezető: Mazón Jánosné

120/1.
9

- No. 1. Róna-Tas, A. Fodor, S.: *Epigraphica Bulgarica*. 1973.
- No. 2. *Die erste sölkupische Fibel aus dem Jahre 1879*. Eingeleitet von P. Hajdú. 1973.
- No. 3. Novickij, Gr.: *Kratkoe opisanie o narode ostjackom (1715)*. 1973.
- No. 4. Paasonen, H.: *Tschuwaschisches Wörterverzeichnis*. Eingeleitet von A. Róna-Tas. 1974.
- No. 5. A. Molnár, F.: *On the History of Word-Final Vowels in the Permian Languages*. 1974.
- No. 6. Hajdú, P.: *Samojedologische Schriften*. 1975.
- No. 7. *N. Witsens Berichte über die uralischen Völker*. Aus dem Niederländischen ins Deutsche übersetzt von T. Mikola. 1975.
- No. 8. Ph. Johann von Strahlenberg: *Das Nord und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (Stockholm. 1730) with an Introduction by I. R. Krueger. 1975.
- No. 9. Kiss, J.: *Studien zur Wortbildung und Etymologie der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen*. 1976.
- No. 10. Káthe U. Kóhalmi: *Chrestomathia Sibirica*.
- No. 11. Mikola, T.: *Materialien zur wotjakischen Etymologie*. 1977.
Auswahl aus der Volksdichtung der Sibirischen Urvölker. 1977.
- No. 12. Popova, Ja. N.: *Nenecko-russkij Slovar (lesnoe narečie)* 1978.
- No. 13. Tardy, L.: *Beyond the Ottoman Empire* 1978.
- No. 14. Clauson, G.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish, Index Vol. I* with a preface by A. Róna-Tas. 1981.
- No. 15. Clauson, G.: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish, Index Vol. II*.
- No. 16. Hont, L.: *Nordostjakisches Wörterverzeichnis*. 1982.
- No. 17. *Studies in Chuvash Etymology I*. Edited by
A. Róna-Tas. 1982.